COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

VOLUME 74

This page intentionally left blank

COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

CONTROVERSIES

APOLOGIA RESPONDENS AD EA QUAE IACOBUS LOPIS STUNICA TAXAVERAT IN PRIMA DUNTAXAT NOVI TESTAMENTI AEDITIONE

APOLOGIA DE TRIBUS LOCIS QUOS UT RECTE TAXATOS A STUNICA DEFENDERAT SANCTIUS CARANZA THEOLOGUS

APOLOGIA ADVERSUS LIBELLUM STUNICAE CUI TITULUM FECIT BLASPHEMIAE ET IMPIETATES ERASMI

APOLOGIA AD PRODROMON STUNICAE

APOLOGIA AD STUNICAE CONCLUSIONES

EPISTOLA APOLOGETICA ADVERSUS STUNICAM

edited by Jan Bloemendal

University of Toronto Press

Toronto / Buffalo / London

The research and publication costs of the
Collected Works of Erasmus are supported by
University of Toronto Press

© University of Toronto Press 2022
Toronto / Buffalo / London
utorontopress.com
Printed in Canada

ISBN 978-1-4875-4629-8 (cloth) ISBN 978-1-4875-4630-4 (EPUB)
ISBN 978-1-4875-4631-1 (PDF)

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Title: Collected works of Erasmus.

Names: Erasmus, Desiderius, –1536, author.

Description: Volume 74 edited by Jan Bloemendal. | Includes bibliographical references and indexes. | Contents: vol. 74. Controversies ; Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione ; Apologia de tribus locis quos ut recte taxatos a Stunica defenderat Sanctius Caranza theologus ; Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi ; Apologia ad Prodromon Stunicae ; Apologia ad Stunicae Conclusiones ; Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam.

Identifiers: Canadiana (print) 74006326x | Canadiana (ebook) 20210206489 | ISBN 9781487546298 (v. 74) | ISBN 9781487546304 (v. 74 ; EPUB) | ISBN 9781487546311 (v. 74 ; PDF)

Subjects: LCSH: Erasmus, Desiderius, –1536 – Correspondence. | LCSH: Bible. New Testament – Commentaries – Early works to 1800. | LCSH: Bible. Psalms – Commentaries – Early works to 1800. | LCSH: Authors, Latin (Medieval and modern) – Netherlands – Correspondence. | LCSH: Humanists – Netherlands – Correspondence. | LCSH: Scholars – Netherlands – Correspondence. | CSH: Erasmus, Desiderius, ca. 1466–1536. | LCGFT: Correspondence. | LCGFT: Sources. | LCGFT: Personal correspondence.

Classification: LCC PA8500 1974 fol. | DDC 199.492–dc19

We wish to acknowledge the land on which the University of Toronto Press operates. This land is the traditional territory of the Wendat, the Anishnaabeg, the Haudenosaunee, the Métis, and the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.

University of Toronto Press acknowledges the financial support of the Government of Canada, the Canada Council for the Arts, and the Ontario Arts Council, an agency of the Government of Ontario, for its publishing activities.

Canada Council for the Arts | Conseil des Arts du Canada

ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL
CONSEIL DES ARTS DE L'ONTARIO
an Ontario government agency
un organisme du gouvernement de l'Ontario

Funded by the Government of Canada | Financé par le gouvernement du Canada

Canada

MIX
Paper from responsible sources
FSC® C016245
FSC www.fsc.org

Collected Works of Erasmus

The aim of the Collected Works of Erasmus
is to make available an accurate, readable English text
of Erasmus' correspondence and his
other principal writings. The edition is planned
and directed by an Editorial Board, an Executive Committee,
and an Advisory Committee.

EDITORIAL BOARD

William Barker, University of King's College
James M. Estes, University of Toronto, *Chair*
Riemer Faber, University of Waterloo
Charles Fantazzi, East Carolina University
James K. Farge, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
John N. Grant, University of Toronto
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies,
Chairman Emeritus
John O'Malley†, Georgetown University
Mechtilde O'Mara, University of Toronto
Jane E. Phillips, University of Kentucky
Erika Rummel, University of Toronto
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
James D. Tracy, University of Minnesota
Mark Vessey, University of British Columbia

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

James M. Estes, University of Toronto
Riemer Faber, University of Waterloo
Charles Fantazzi, East Carolina University
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Jessica Mosher, University of Toronto Press
Jane E. Phillips, University of Kentucky
Suzanne Rancourt, University of Toronto Press, *Chair*

Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
Mark Vessey, University of British Columbia

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jan Bloemendal, Conseil international ASD
Amy Nelson Burnett, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
H.J. de Jonge†, Leiden University
Anthony Grafton, Princeton University
Ian W.F. Maclean, Oxford University
J. Trapman, Conseil international ASD
Timothy J. Wengert, The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia

Contents

Introduction
by Charles Fantazzi
ix

An Apologia by Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam Replying to Diego López Zúñiga's Criticism of the First Edition of the New Testament
Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione
translated and annotated by Erika Rummel
1

An Apologia Concerning Three Passages which the Theologian Sancho Carranza Had Defended as Rightly Criticized by Zúñiga
Apologia de tribus locis quos ut recte taxatos a Stunica defenderat Sanctius Caranza theologus
translated and annotated by Charles Fantazzi
161

Apologia against the Work of Diego Zúñiga Entitled 'Blasphemies and Impieties of Erasmus'
Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi
translated and annotated by Stephen Ryle†, reviewed by Charles Fantazzi
241

Apologia against Zúñiga's 'Precursor' / *Apologia ad Prodromon Stunicae*
translated and annotated by Erika Rummel
287

Apologia against Zúñiga's 'Conclusions' / *Apologia ad Stunicae Conclusiones*
translated by Douglas H. Shantz, annotated by Erika Rummel
303

A Letter of Defence in Response to Zúñiga / *Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam* translated and annotated by Alexander Dalzell†
333

Works Frequently Cited
360

Short-Title Forms for Erasmus' Works
363

Index of Scriptural References
369

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited
376

General Index
379

Introduction

CHARLES FANTAZZI

The publication of the *Novum Instrumentum* in 1516 brought Erasmus European fame as a theologian and biblical scholar, but also raised much controversy, from several sides. Two of his fiercest enemies were situated in an orthodox Roman Catholic country: Spain. The quarrel with them lasted from 1520 to 1524, with a later, further response by Erasmus in 1529.

The humanist Juan de Vergara, formerly secretary to the famous Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, founder of the University of Alcalá de Henares, and subsequently to his successor, Guillaume de Croy, wrote a letter to Erasmus from Brussels on 24 April 1522 informing him of a potential new opponent, Sancho Carranza de Miranda (Sanctius Caranza d 1531), who had just published a book critical of Erasmus.[1] He had sent a copy to Vergara, asking him in a prefatory letter to assure Erasmus that his feelings toward him were not at all hostile, but entirely open-minded and respectful. Vergara describes him as an expert in philosophy and theology of the subtle sort and a man of upright and modest character. At the end of the letter he promises to send the book to Erasmus, entrusting the task to Vives, who had to procure it at court in Bruges and then sent it on through another messenger.

Carranza attained fame in his youth as a theologian and an able and subtle dialectician in Paris. He occupied a chair at Alcalá from 1510 until 1518, where he taught successively logic, natural philosophy, and theology. In 1514 he published a work entitled *De alterationis modo ac quiditate*, the result of his philosophical disputes with Agostino Nifo, which appeared at Rome in 1514. His next work was *Progymnasmata logicalia,* published at Alcalá in 1516. During a stay in Rome from 1520 to 1522 he wrote a tract entitled *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi Roterodami Annotationes* (Rome 1522)

* * * * *

1 Ep 1277; on Sancho Carranza de Miranda, see *Contemporaries* 1 273–4 (William B. Jones).

in defence of a fierce criticism of certain statements made in Erasmus' first edition of the New Testament entitled *Novum Instrumentum* (1516) written by Diego López Zúñiga (Jacobus Lopes Stunica d 1531).[2] Erasmus had immediately written a refutation of this criticism in his *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione* (Louvain 1521).[3] Here Erasmus discusses and examines the many passages criticized by his Spanish opponent, a discussion that had a philological character and concerned the choices he had made in his *Novum Testamentum* and his annotations. Carranza in turn wrote his *Opusculum*, in which he singled out three responses of Erasmus to Zúñiga's criticism of his annotations which he considered to be inaccurate, and made Erasmus suspect of holding heretical views. Those three responses concern: 1) whether the New Testament speaks clearly of Christ as God; 2) whether the term *servus* should be applied to Christ; 3) whether it can be said that the sacramental character of matrimony *cannot* be deduced from Eph 5:32, and consequently whether this denial influenced Luther's rejection of the sacramental character of matrimony. Zúñiga and Carranza respond in the affirmative to the first two questions and negatively to the third as against the contrary judgments of Erasmus. Thus, the discussion turned from a philological quarrel to a dogmatic-theological war with two formidable opponents.

In a letter of 25 June 1522 to his very good friend Pierre Barbier, Erasmus makes reference to Carranza, describing him as 'no toothless babe in arms,'[4] intimating that he was a new enemy. Actually, he had already written his reply to Carranza in the previous month, which would be followed by his second apologia against Zúñiga, viz against his *Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi*.[5] He attached a copy of Carranza's own work with a brief sarcastic prefatory note in which he says that the author in discussing three passages from Zúñiga's *Annotations* wastes no effort in attacking Erasmus.[6] The first of the scriptural passages to be discussed is John 1:1, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the word was God.' It was Erasmus' comment on this passage that he was not quite certain that the name of God is openly attributed to Christ in the writings of the apostles and the evangelists

* * * * *

2 On Diego López Zúñiga, see *Contemporaries* 2 348–9 (William B. Jones and Thomas B. Deutscher).
3 Below, pp 1–160
4 Ep 1294:7
5 See *Blasphemiae.*
6 Below, pp 241–85

except in two or three places that sparked the debate. The apologia begins with the annotation of Zúñiga, who retorts that the name of God is not attributed to Christ in two or three places, as Erasmus claims, but in many places, of which he names ten. Erasmus had already answered this argument in his apology against Zúñiga, but he does so again as well as answering new passages adduced by Carranza. Erasmus insisted that these passages could not provide absolute certainty since there was always room for *tergiversatio,* ie equivocation, in interpreting them.

The second section, dealing with the word *παῖς*, also begins with a quotation from Zúñiga. In the first edition of his translation of the New Testament Erasmus retained the Vulgate reading '*puer*' in Acts 4:27, but in the annotation he made reference to Valla's observation that the word '*puer*' had the connotation of servant or slave. Accordingly, he changed it to '*Filius*' in the second edition of 1519 and retained it in all further editions. Zúñiga then threatened him that if he said that the appellation 'servant' was not suitable, he might fall into the error of the Apollinarists, who denied Christ's humanity, and if he said that he obeyed him as a Son, he would fall into the error of the Arians, who denied Christ's equal divinity with God. Erasmus rejects both charges and indulges in a bit of argumentum ad hominem at first, but then embarks on an elaborate argument which is very hard to follow and is often rather specious. He spends a lot of time ridiculing Carranza's 'wonderful dialectics,' mimicking him with his own inexpert attempts to employ his opponent's language. Erasmus takes the view of Ambrosiaster,[7] that the word '*servus*' is explained as referring to Christ's humiliation and passion, not to his humanity as such.[8]

In the discussion of the third scriptural passage, Eph 5:32, Erasmus certainly seems to emerge victorious. In his opinion the phrase '*sacramentum hoc magnum est*' cannot of itself be interpreted to mean that matrimony, which was discussed in the preceding verses, is a sacrament as Carranza claims. He had translated the Greek *μυστήριον* as *mysterium,* not *sacramentum*, as in the Vulgate. In his defence he responds that he has declared that matrimony is a sacrament in more than ten passages,[9] including his poem that is often read

* * * * *

7 A commentary on Paul's epistles by an anonymous author, long attributed to St Ambrose

8 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7 CSEL 81 140

9 See his notes on this verse in *Annotations on Galatians and Ephesians* CWE 58 209–11, where he explains in the continuation of the verse, 'ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia' (but I apply it to Christ and the church) that this great mystery pertains to Christ and the church, not to husband and wife.

aloud in the classroom,[10] and also his *Encomium of Matrimony*. He refutes Carranza's gratuitous insinuation that his comments on Eph 5:32 had influenced Luther's rejection of matrimony as a sacrament. In closing Erasmus rejects Carranza's humble peroration as not coming from the heart and reserves some acerbic remarks for Zúñiga. He ends with this pungent advice to Carranza, 'not to expose himself to scorn with such foolish, unlearned, acrimonious, and fraudulent little books.'[11]

The year before, Erasmus had set about answering a much harsher attack written by Zúñiga, who had studied Greek at Salamanca under the famous Portuguese scholar and humanist, Aires Barbosa, was proficient in Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and had some knowledge of Aramaic and Arabic. There is clear evidence that he participated in the preparation of the Complutensian Polyglot under the direction of Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros at the University of Alcalá.[12] According to his own statement he collated Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuscripts of both the Septuagint and the New Testament with the Latin Vulgate in this huge enterprise. When copies of Erasmus' first edition of the New Testament, entitled *Novum Instrumentum*, reached Alcalá in the summer of 1516, Zúñiga immediately began to write his *Annotationes* against it, which was the beginning of a series of polemical interchanges with Erasmus. When he had completed a draft of his annotations on Erasmus' work, he showed it to Cardinal Jiménez, who recommended that he send his criticisms to Erasmus. Zúñiga did not hearken to this advice and refrained from writing against Erasmus until after the cardinal's death on 8 November 1517. Zúñiga's *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti* were printed in Rome by the printer Arnau Guillén de Brocar, printer for the Polyglot, some time before he set out for Rome in August 1520. In a preface to the reader he claims that he must defend Jerome against Erasmus' criticisms of the Vulgate and condemns his audacity in making a new translation of the Greek text, which he deemed to be altogether unnecessary. He admits that there might be errors and corrupt readings in the Vulgate but insists that Erasmus could have recorded them separately rather than produce a completely new translation. In Zúñiga's view this amounted to an insult to Jerome's Vulgate and to the traditions

* * * * *

10 *Carmen* 49 *Christiani hominis institutum* CWE 85 97

11 'ne post hac tam ineptis, indoctis, amarulentis ac fucatis libellis se ipsum traducat' ASD IX-8 100:875–6

12 The adjective Complutensian is derived from Complutum, the Latin name for Alcalá.

of the church. In a certain sense Zúñiga was right. We now know that in fact the manuscripts of the Byzantine church that Erasmus was able to obtain from different sources were from a relatively late and inferior stage of transmission, less reliable than the Vulgate itself.

After this indignant condemnation Zúñiga proceeds to list a series of 212 annotations arranged in the order of the books and chapters of the New Testament, in which he criticizes in detail Erasmus' new Latin translation and annotations. In some cases, especially when Semitic philology was involved, he was right, but most of the time he was not. A few months after their publication he set out for Rome, where he remained for the rest of his life. He took a great number of the printed copies of his book to Rome, hoping perhaps to convince leading clerics of the dangers inherent in Erasmus' teachings. This plan proved unsuccessful, as we shall see.

In the meantime Erasmus finally secured a copy of Zúñiga's attack almost a year after its publication, as he informs Pierre Barbier, his old friend who was then in the service of Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht, the future Pope Adrian VI. The letter is dripping with sarcasm from start to finish, as in these words at the very beginning: 'I have no wish to damage his reputation; in fact, I even wish him a double portion of what he so generously allows himself, although he is so mean towards me that he strips me of everything – brains, memory, judgment, scholarship, familiarity with Scripture, knowledge of the tongues, and even of grammar – while claiming for himself, charmingly enough, a kind of horn of plenty overflowing with them all.'[13] Erasmus was rightfully offended that Zúñiga often referred to him as a Batavian (Dutchman) as if he were a barbarian. He was also insulted that almost every note was accompanied by an abusive opening and conclusion.

Erasmus lost no time in replying to this attack, publishing his *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione* with the Leuven printer Dirk Martens in October 1521.[14] In this apology he responded with a counter-argument to every one of the 221 criticisms listed by his opponent in a very concise manner. He first quotes the Vulgate passage in dispute, then gives a brief account of his own commentary, then a summary of Zúñiga's criticism, and finally the defence of his original translation and commentary. Often he refers to other controversies in which he had already justified his commentaries and also takes the opportunity to augment what he had already written in them. An abundant dose of

* * * * *

13 Ep 1216:4–9, 26 June 1521

14 See above, p x and the translation below, pp 1–160.

irony and sarcasm is not lacking from the very beginning, where he describes his foe as the monster Geryon returned to life not with three bodies, but with three tongues, referring of course to Zúñiga's vaunted linguistic abilities.[15]

At this point Juan de Vergara, who had also participated in the Polyglot project and indeed had been the secretary of Cardinal Jiménez, enters the picture. He sent a copy of Erasmus' apologia to Zúñiga with the intention of reconciling the two men, and took the opportunity to sing the praises of Erasmus as a man of exceptional intellect and judgment and of almost immeasurable energy, one who was admired and esteemed among scholars in Germany, Belgium and Britain. He ends his eulogy with this stirring description: 'You may take my word for it that he stands supreme in the judgment of learned and unlearned alike.'[16] Zúñiga was not at all impressed by these encomia. In fact, as he informs Vergara in a return letter dated 9 January 1522, he had already planned a second book which was more or less ready for publication, his *Erasmi Roterodami blasphemiae et impietates*. Actually, he had already completed in the previous year the first, much longer version of this work in three volumes, containing a series of quotations from several of Erasmus' works accompanied by derogatory comments of his own, which was meant to be submitted to Pope Leo X to obtain his approbation of the book.[17] In a prefatory letter to the Pope he elaborates on the affinities between the heretical ideas of Erasmus and those of Luther. There are also extant a series of four letters that Zúñiga wrote to Leo X sometime in 1520 or 1521. They have been published by Professor de Jonge and are of extreme interest.[18] They are a vitriolic, almost fanatical attack on Erasmus as if he were the Antichrist. To the accusations of blasphemy and impiety Zúñiga adds insanity. He speaks of Erasmus' putrid breast and claims that all the Lutheran impieties have streamed from this foul source. The last of the four books is a fierce denunciation of the *Praise of Folly*. Later, when he attempted to read fragments from the *Blasphemiae et impietates* in Roman circles, Pope Leo forbade him to publish it or anything else that might harm Erasmus' reputation. It was not until after the death of Leo X, on 1 December 1521, that Zúñiga

* * * * *

15 ASD IX-2 62:53–4

16 A letter from Juan de Vergara to Diego López Zúñiga, dated 10 October 1521, CWE 8 339:109–10; the text of the exchange of letters between Juan de Vergara and Zúñiga is contained in Allen IV 620–32.

17 A manuscript copy of this original version is preserved in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples.

18 H.J. de Jonge, 'Four unpublished letters on Erasmus from J.L. Stunica to Pope Leo X (1520)' in *Colloque érasmien de Liège* ed J.P. Massaut (Paris 1987), 147–60.

dared to publish his work in an abridged form in May 1522, omitting his own copious comments and leaving only the excerpts from Erasmus' work to speak for themselves, as it were. He brags to Vergara that it has just come hot off the press, filled with heretical beliefs of all sorts, including those of Luther himself. He does not care if Erasmus is exalted in Germany, called the sun and the moon, so long as Italy calls him the enemy of religion and Rome considers him a blasphemer who deserves the same penalty as Luther, that is, to be declared a public enemy of the Roman church.[19]

As usual, Erasmus did not take long to respond. He completed his *Apologia adversus libellum Iacobi Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates* on 13 June 1522.[20] As he did previously, he examines, one by one, all the passages Zúñiga had cited and refutes each of his accusations and insinuations. This part of the quarrel is philological and dogmatic. The topics include Erasmus' pronouncements on papal authority, the veneration of the saints, ecclesiastical ceremonies, indulgences, the sacraments, especially confession and matrimony, ecclesiastical possessions, religious orders, pilgrimages and miracles, fasting, and canonical hours. Erasmus takes issue with Zúñiga's loose interpretation of the term 'blasphemy' to mean any kind of criticism of men's behaviour and the word 'impiety' to refer to Erasmus' strictures against what he considered exaggerated forms of piety, such as the superstitious veneration of the saints and false religiosity. He respects the teaching methods of scholastic philosophy but believes that it has degenerated into a sophistic science. He does not hesitate to express his quandaries about the descent of the papacy in a direct line from Peter nor is he able successfully to disguise his doubts about papal infallibility. The most dangerous of Zúñiga's accusations was to call Erasmus the leader and standard bearer of the Lutherans, which Erasmus denied forcefully, insisting as he always did, that he did not want to belong to any faction. Zúñiga had gone as far as to threaten Erasmus that if he did not make a public refutation of Luther, he would denounce him as a Lutheran in Rome. Erasmus answered bluntly that he was not going to take orders from him.

Erasmus' reply to the *Blasphemiae et impietates* was still in press when Zúñiga published his *Libellus trium illorum voluminum praecursor*, which was a warning that he was intending to publish the original complete text of the *Blasphemiae*. The three volumes actually discuss the same three passages

* * * * *

19 See CWE 8 345, Letter 4, Zúñiga to Juan de Vergara.
20 See below, pp 241–52.

discussed by Carranza in his work.[21] Zúñiga mentions in a letter to Vergara that certain friends of Erasmus had thought that his arguments against Erasmus had been completely demolished.[22] With a bravado vaunting his Spanish heritage he remarks: 'I am afraid these people do not appreciate our Spanish mettle or realize that we are a nation which would sooner be robbed of life than of honour.'[23] In his *Libellus* Zúñiga criticizes once again Erasmus' doubts about the sacramental character of matrimony, which he claimed had influenced Luther's heretical views on the subject. Erasmus obtained a copy of this brief work in time to add his response as an appendix to his apology against Zúñiga's *Blasphemiae*, in which Zúñiga had called into question Erasmus' ability as a theologian, remarking that Erasmus may have obtained a degree in theology but that this was as nothing compared to his own studies of Scripture for more than twenty years. He was probably not aware that Erasmus had received his degree from the rather obscure University of Turin on 4 September 1506 after a stay of only a few weeks. Erasmus did not bother to answer these accusations but ridiculed Zúñiga's vainglory. He does answer, however, Zúñiga's insinuation that there were parallels between his views on matrimony and those of Luther. He insists that he considers matrimony to be a sacrament of the church whereas it is said that Luther denies this altogether. Zúñiga also made reference to a collection of German pamphlets, *XV Bundsgenosse* (ie 'confederates'), published in 1521 by Johann Eberlin von Günzberg, in which portraits of Erasmus were included as a Lutheran reformer. Erasmus protested that he had never seen this publication and expatiated on various matters in which he held radically different views than those of Luther.

Zúñiga took advantage of the interregnum after the death of Adrian VI in 1523 to return to the attack with a brief pamphlet of only five pages entitled *Conclusiones principaliter suspectae et scandalosae quae reperiuntur in libris Erasmi Roterodami* (Particularly suspect and scandalous conclusions found in the books of Erasmus of Rotterdam). Erasmus claimed that no publisher wanted to print it and that it was sold by street vendors hawking eggs, mushrooms, almanacs, song sheets and other such bagatelles.[24] It treated of the usual disputed subjects: the primacy of Peter, confession, extreme unction, matrimony, canonical prayers and ceremonies.

* * * * *

21 See above, pp ix–x on Carranza; for Erasmus' reply, see pp 287–302 below.

22 These friends were Pierre Barbier, Paolo Bombace, and Jakob Ziegler. See CWE 8 458 n5.

23 CWE 8 343:14–16

24 See LB IX 385A–B; ASD IX-2 27.

Soon after Clement VII's accession to the papacy Erasmus wrote him a letter informing him about the attacks launched against him by 'that madman Zúñiga,' which he says cast a shadow on the good name of the Holy See.[25] The pope harkened to his plea and ordered Zúñiga to be silent, as we learn in a letter to Guy Morillon, secretary of Charles V.[26] Erasmus wrote a brief response in which he points out that Zúñiga's 'conclusions' are nothing but a few reflections on passages from his annotations to the New Testament written before Luther's name was known.[27] His attempt to brand Erasmus as a Lutheran sympathizer was a failure.

Nevertheless, the Spanish theologian did not desist. He now turned to the discussion of philological questions in two more polemical pamphlets, a vindication of the Latinity of the Vulgate and the accusation that Erasmus had used Zúñiga's own suggestions in the third edition of the New Testament without acknowledgment.[28] The first is directed against an index added by Erasmus to the second edition of the Vulgate (1519), which listed forty-five passages in which he said there were 'manifest and inexcusable solecisms.' This brief tract incited the vehement ire of Zúñiga who set out to defend the language of the Vulgate as good and elegant Latin in his *Assertio,* listing each of the solecisms that Erasmus criticizes. He maintained that it was acceptable to use vocabulary even from the Roman playwrights, Plautus and Terence, or to translate Greek idioms literally as long as it was understandable.

Erasmus did not deign to answer Zúñiga's accusations until five years later. It was when he was sorting out his baggage after his move to Freiburg that he happened upon a copy of the pamphlet and decided to dash off a reply. He included it as part of a letter to a young friend of his, Hubertus Barlandus, which was later to be known as *Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam*), or *Soloecismi*.[29] Erasmus immediately dismissed the argument that the language of poetry, especially that of archaic Roman comedy, could be used for the sacred text. Only the language of approved authors could serve as a model. He insisted that Zúñiga's claim that Greek or Hebrew idioms translated into Latin could be easily understood was pure nonsense. The audience for which he wrote was more familiar with classical Latin rather than Vulgar Latin.

* * * * *

25 Ep 1418:24–6

26 Ep 1431:14

27 See pp 303–31 below.

28 *Assertio ecclesiasticae translationis Novi Testamenti a soloecismis quos illi Erasmus Roterodamus impegerat* and *Loca quae ex Stunicae annotationibus, illius suppresso nomine, in tertia editione Novi Testamenti*

29 ASD IX-8 305–39; CWE 15 Ep 2172; see pp 333–58 below.

As for the *Loca* he did not bother to respond, probably considering them too trivial for his attention, and by this time he was weary of Zúñiga's harassments. The latter, however, did not cease from taking notes on Erasmus' editions of Jerome and succeeding editions of the New Testament with the aim of criticizing his commentaries, as we learn from a letter of Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (CWE 19 Ep 2729), who relates to Erasmus that before his death Zúñiga had left further observations which he wished to be sent to him. They consisted of eighty notes on his *Scholia* on the letters and other writings of Jerome and more than a hundred on the fourth edition of the New Testament. They were eventually sent to Erasmus by Iñigo López de Mendoza y Zúñiga, cardinal-bishop of Burgos. As far as we know, he never made use of them.

It may be useful to give a list of the publications in this 'Spanish War'[30] of Erasmus:

1 Stunica, *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti*. 1520
2 Erasmus, *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Noui Testamenti aeditione*. 1521
3 Caranza, *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi Annotationes*. 1522
4 Erasmus, *Apologia de tribus locis quos ut recte taxatos a Stunica defenderat Sanctius Caranza theologus*. 1522
5 Stunica, *Erasmi Roterodami blasphemiae et impietates nunc primum propalatae ac proprio volumine alias redargutae*. 1522
6 Erasmus, *Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi*. 1522
7 Stunica, *Libellus trium illorum voluminum praecursor, quibus Erasmicas impietates ac blasphemias redarguit*. 1522
8 Erasmus, *Apologia ad Prodromon Stunicae*. 1522
9 Stunica, *Conclusiones principaliter suspecte et scandalose que reperiuntur in libris Erasmi Roterodami*. 1522
10 Erasmus, *Apologia ad Stunicae Conclusiones*. 1524
11 Stunica, *Assertio ecclesiasticae translationis Noui Testamenti a soloecismis quos illi Erasmus Roterodamus impegerat*. 1524
12 Stunica, *Loca quae ex Stunicae annotationibus, illius suppresso nomine, in tertia editione Novi Testamenti Erasmus emendauit*. 1524
13 Erasmus, *Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam.* 1529

* * * * *

30 Derived from the list made by Henk Jan de Jonge ASD IX-8 2–3

EDITOR'S NOTE

The translators, annotators, and editor are greatly indebted to Henk Jan de Jonge, who edited Erasmus' polemical writings against Zúñiga and Carranza in ASD IX-2 and IX-8, masterpieces of scholarly editing. They also wish to express their gratitude to the board of CWE for entrusting this work to them, Evelyn Mackie for carefully editing the texts, and to the University of Toronto Press for turning the manuscript into a beautiful book. Thanks are also due to Emma Stafford and Claire Ryle for retrieving and delivering the manuscript translation of the late Stephen Ryle, to whose memory we would like to dedicate this volume, as well as to the memories of Henk Jan de Jonge and Alexander Dalzell.

This page intentionally left blank

AN APOLOGIA BY DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM REPLYING TO DIEGO LÓPEZ ZÚÑIGA'S CRITICISM OF THE FIRST EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione

translated and annotated by

ERIKA RUMMEL

(ASD IX-2 59–267; LB IX 283–356)

AN APOLOGIA BY DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM REPLYING TO DIEGO LÓPEZ ZÚÑIGA'S CRITICISM OF THE FIRST EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

> Who will read this?
> Are you asking me? No one, by Hercules.
> No one?
> Well, one or two at most.[1]

I know, dear reader, you will immediately say: 'What novel kind of proem is this?' Indeed, these lines from a satire by Persius came vividly to mind when, at the instance of friends, I got ready to answer Diego Zúñiga's book in which he criticizes some passages in the first edition of my New Testament where he thinks I have been remiss. For who has so much time on his hands that he would wish to read squabbles of this kind? Even if in our time one or two can be found who, from an interest in the parties, wish to turn their eyes and attention to them, posterity at any rate will either remain unaware of them or think them of little value. Once polemics raged between Poggio and Lorenzo Valla,[2] undeniably a learned and eloquent man. His *Elegantiae*[3] are almost the only work of his we have at hand, and nothing is more frigid in our eyes now than the books in which the two men carried on so heatedly then.

Whenever I contemplate in my mind how short and fleeting this life is and, moreover, how small a portion of it I have left, it troubles me deeply

* * * * *

1 Persius 1.2–3

2 In 1452 and 1453 Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1458), papal secretary, and Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), apostolic scriptor, engaged in a vehement polemic over stylistic matters, which degenerated into invectives and mutual accusations of heresy and immorality.

3 A style manual. Erasmus published a paraphrase of the work: *Paraphrasis seu potius epitome in Elegantiarum libros Laurentii Vallae* (first authorized edition Freiburg 1531). An unauthorized edition had earlier been printed in Cologne and Paris, 1529. See Ep 2416.

to waste time – by far the most precious and irreplaceable thing – on such nonsense, to say nothing of the fact that while we are trading accusations in quarrels of this kind, that wonderful tranquillity of the mind is lost, the sweet pleasure of studies is lost, and a good part of their fruit too, as many people are being alienated from these studies.

Yet I would go as far as giving thanks to Zúñiga if he had, for the benefit of the public, collected what I overlooked, or corrected passages in which I went wrong, a task to which I actually invited scholars in the first edition – for even then I did not conceal the fact that it was rather rushed and premature. I only wished he had made this useful contribution to studies in such a manner as to earn for himself a reputation for modesty and fairmindedness. But his book is such that if you took away the insulting words with which he sometimes lashes out at me, sometime ridicules me, if you took away the openings and perorations directed at me, the jibes and taunts he uses, playing the buffoon rather than the theologian, not much would be left of the volume. And if only Zúñiga, whoever he is, had not obeyed his own impulse or listened to the instigations of certain men rather than the prudent and equally friendly counsel of the reverend lord, Francisco Cisneros, the cardinal of Toledo![4] Cisneros has now been succeeded by my friend Guillaume Croy,[5] that is, an old man by a youth, though worthy of growing old in this post of honour. At least I hear that Cisneros, an excellent man, when he became aware of Zúñiga's machinations against me, gave him the advice (plainly a Christian one) to send his work to me before publishing it. If I satisfied him in my reply it would be in his greater interest to have the book suppressed rather than published; if I was reluctant to reply, however, or if I replied impudently or boorishly, he should publish his efforts – and good luck with them – and champion the truth without regard for me. Indeed, when Zúñiga by chance found the excellent Cisneros with my New Testament edition in his hands, he began to express surprise that he should turn his eyes to such

* * * * *

4 Cardinal Ximénes de Cisneros (1436–1517), archbishop of Toledo from 1495 and Inquisitor General. He was the founder of the University of Alcalà (opened 1508) and brought together a team of scholars, among them Diego López Zúñiga (Jacobus Lopis Stunica), to edit the so-called Complutensian Polyglot, an edition of the Bible in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic. It was completed in 1517, but waiting for the papal imprimatur and other circumstances led to a delay in publication, so that it appeared only in 1520 and was not widely distributed before 1522. Erasmus declined an invitation from the prelate to collaborate on the edition (see Epp 541, 597, 628, 809).

5 Guillaume Croy (c 1498–1521), archbishop of Toledo from 1517

nonsense. The book was full of mistakes and monstrous errors, he said. At this point the cardinal reproached the fellow's petulance with grave words, as certain most trustworthy people report[6] who were then in the cardinal's presence. 'I wish,' he said, 'everyone was a prophet of this kind![7] Produce something better, if you can, but do not condemn another man's effort.'

Accordingly, Zúñiga suppressed his slanderous booklet during the cardinal's lifetime – I only wish it had appeared then, for I have no doubt that it was both less mature and more ignorant than it is now. But immediately[8] after the cardinal died, Zúñiga handed his work to the printers, without so much as giving me notice by letter – acting, no doubt, on the instigation of certain people who unfortunately have time on their hands and like to get their vile and no less cruel pleasure from this type of fencing match between scholars. For I cannot convince myself that a noble and well-born spirit should conceive such ill will against someone who never did him any harm. For apparently Zúñiga claims a place among those who combine a splendid pedigree with a reputation for learning. Indeed, if desire for reputation drove him on – a motive he need not be ashamed of at all, especially since he is a layman, or so I understand – he would have gained a more praiseworthy reputation if he had embarked on the road to fame with a work that did not involve the defamation of another, or a work at any rate that had adorned the splendour of learning with the recommendation of modesty. But as it stands now, what an unpleasant, what a harsh preface – consisting of almost as many insults as words and breathing contempt everywhere for Erasmus the Dutchman![9]

The gentleman hoped, I suppose, that a casual reader would think of him as some hero come down from heaven, or a reincarnation of the famous

* * * * *

6 Cisneros' reaction to Zúñiga's criticism of Erasmus was reported to him by Juan Vergara (1492–1557), the Cardinal's secretary and collaborator on the Complutensian Polyglot. He tried in vain to make peace between Zúñiga and Erasmus (see his letter to Zúñiga, printed in Allen IV Ep 624:47–60). After the Cardinal's death, Vergara served Cisneros' successor, Guillaume Croy. In 1521 he became court chaplain of Emperor Charles V, and from 1524 he was secretary to Alonso de Fonseca, the new archbishop of Toledo. In 1535 Vergara was investigated, arrested, and tried on heresy charges. He was fined and forced to abjure, and died shortly after his release from prison, which had undermined his health.

7 An allusion to Num 11:29 'I wish that all the Lord's people were prophets.'

8 In fact, Zúñiga published his work three years after the Cardinal's death.

9 Erasmus was a Dutchman, but Zúñiga used the designation as an insult, since Dutchmen were proverbially dull (see *Adagia* IV vi 35).

Geryon[10] – equipped with three tongues rather than three bodies – who had more contempt for Erasmus than the Indian elephant for a gnat.[11] He did not realize, however, that it is easier to disdain than to surpass, to ridicule than to refute.

What qualities others attribute to me is not in my control. I certainly make next to no claims for myself. What I have to offer I have demonstrated in my books; I should strive in vain if I wished to appear what I am not. Just as I have never made special claims for myself, I am so far from detracting anything from Zúñiga's fame that I wish him twice as much as he so generously allows himself. By contrast, he is so niggardly and mean to me that he would take clothing from the naked, as they say,[12] depriving the unfortunate Dutchman of every single quality: intelligence, memory, diligence, judgment, learning, familiarity with and understanding of Holy Writ, skill in any language, correct diction, and even knowledge of Latin grammar. And not content with having said it once, he repeats the same things in almost every single annotation, adding new little prefaces and dramatic exclamations with the taste of aloes.[13] It appears, however, that he does not have a very high opinion of his reader, thinking him unable to retain what has already been drummed into him so often. And at times he thinks of himself as marvellously charming when he makes fun of me, wallowing and rollicking – he thinks – in Attic wit.[14] I am certainly pleased to think that languages and good literature are flourishing also among the Spaniards. And I have certainly great expectations of Zúñiga's talent – there is good hope that hereafter he will make better use of his talent, his learning, his paper, and his time. But I fear that, through his own fault, he will not gain as splendid a reputation as he seems to promise himself from these first-fruits of his studies.[15]

He may hope to convince the reader that he knows best what respect is due to the Translator, since he is equipped with the knowledge of every

* * * * *

10 Mythological monster with three bodies, killed by Heracles
11 See *Adagia* III i 27.
12 *Adagia* I iv 76
13 Proverbial for bitterness, see *Adagia* I viii 66.
14 Attic wit and eloquence was proverbial, see *Adagia* I ii 57.
15 The attack on Erasmus was, however, not Zúñiga's first publication. He had published a critique of Jacques Lefèvre (*Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem*) in 1519. Lefèvre (1455–1536), French theologian, began publishing commentaries on the New Testament in 1512 and completed a French translation of the New Testament in 1523. He faced a great deal of hostility from conservative theologians but enjoyed the protection of Marguerite of Navarre.

language and literature, with wise judgment, a perspicacious mind, long and diligent studies in the classical authors, wonderful lexica and other men's commentaries, while I have only yesterday or the day before laid a finger on Holy Scriptures and do not understand a word in them – I, who twenty years ago wrote the *Enchiridion*,[16] a book approved by even the most learned theologians, a book which proves at any rate that I was even then well-read in Scripture. Even in the present book of *Annotations*, which he rightly calls 'rushed,'[17] I adduce a great deal of evidence from various Greek as well as Latin authors. Who will believe him when he writes that he undertook this work not from any desire to speak ill of anyone, but with a pure heart free of all contentiousness, when the whole book breathes nothing but contempt and hatred for me? For I should not wish to bring against so great a man the suspicion of jealousy.

There is no measure and no limit to his censures, jibes, cutting remarks, slanders, and misrepresentations. And although in such a vast work there cannot but be many things that merit approval, Zúñiga is so far from approving anything that he often misrepresents even the simplest words, turning light trifles into grave tragedies. Here is an example: I mention in passing Naples 'in Italy, now occupied by the Spaniards.'[18] He almost drags me into court for lèse-majesté for depriving the emperor of his hereditary right, for accusing the Spaniards of ruling arbitrarily – and for no other reason than that I used the term 'occupied' instead of 'held.' Another time, when I made a harmless joke, saying that in Paul[19] Spain is being robbed of the first syllable because we read *Σπανία* there for *Ἱσπανία*, whereas the Spaniards themselves are in the habit of adding a letter of their own to similar words, 'saying *especto* for *specto*,' Zúñiga raises a tragic fuss, saying that I accuse the whole Spanish nation of ignorance. Zúñiga, I think, is certainly the man to make a small city great,[20] for nothing is so tiny that he does not build it up to huge proportions. If there is a passage where, in his opinion, I have not given sufficient thought to Jerome's meaning, he immediately exclaims that I am 'totally without understanding,' either of Jerome or any other writer. If anywhere I give to a Greek word an interpretation somewhat different from that which he had in

* * * * *

16 Published in 1503

17 Zúñiga uses the word *tumultuarius* (hasty) in his notes on Matt 1:23 and Mark 10:46.

18 In his annotation on Acts 16:11

19 Rom 15:24

20 An allusion to the sophist Gorgias who boasted of using rhetoric to 'make small things seem great and great things small' (Plato, *Phaedrus* 267A)

mind, I am being derided and made out as 'totally ignorant' of Greek letters. And in another place he says that I am 'totally' without knowledge of Latin grammar because I did not approve of using *retinere* in the sense of recollecting – a usage Zúñiga himself has so far been unable to document in any Latin author, even though he has been engaged for whole centuries in studying the very best writers.[21]

Indeed, somewhere he attempts to put me under suspicion of a double heresy when there was not the least occasion for it. He says I am guilty of the heresy of the Apollinarists because I cited the authority of Valla who says that the epithet *servus* [servant] does not apply to Christ as man but only in so far as he was condemned to death as a criminal. Yet both Ambrose and Chrysostom are of the same opinion.[22] Secondly, I am guilty of the heresy of the Arians[23] because I said that Christ was subordinate to the Father, but as a son not as a servant, that is, out of love and on his own accord, not through fear – how impudently and boorishly he accuses me I shall demonstrate in its proper place. He repeatedly makes my ignorance of Hebrew a reproach[24] although I admit everywhere without reserve that I am unskilled in this language. But why not go further and reproach me in the same breath for not having wings?

He declares that I have picked Jerome as my personal target because I somewhere respectfully disagree with him, whereas it is no secret to anyone how much I defer to Jerome everywhere.[25] He casts in my teeth my helper Oecolampadius who, he says somewhere – I know not why – has only recently been invented by me.[26] But there is no reason why Oecolampadius should

* * * * *

21 Zúñiga made these accusations in his annotations on 1 Cor 4:3, Eph 2:14, Phil 3:5, John 12:3, Heb 2:1, 2 Thess 2:5.

22 A reference to Zúñiga's annotation on Acts 4:27 reacting to Erasmus' annotations. Apollinaris (c 310–390) claimed that Christ was not completely man. For Erasmus' response see pp 69–74 below.

23 Arius (c 250–336) denied that Christ was truly divine and equal to God the Father. See also below, *Apologia ad Caranzam* n17. For Erasmus' response see pp 197–201.

24 For example, in his annotation on Matt 21:42

25 In his annotation on Matt 26:31, Zúñiga accuses Erasmus of engaging Jerome in *monomachia* (single combat).

26 Erasmus mistakenly thought Zúñiga's words 'recently invented' (in his annotation on Luke 16:20) applied to Oecolampadius (see n218 below). Erasmus acknowledged the help he received from Oecolampadius (1482–1531) in his preface to the *Annotations* (Ep 373:75–83), calling him his 'Theseus.' Oecolampadius was the chief reformer of Basel. The two men's friendship soured over the

in any respect be despised by Zúñiga except perhaps for the sole reason that he is a German – just as he thinks nothing of me because I am a Dutchman. As far as Hebrew is concerned, I generally followed the authority of Jerome. And in the passage pointed out, Oecolampadius inserted the Hebrew, then added a very short comment. I could have taken the credit for it, in fact in his usual kindness Oecolampadius would gladly have attributed it to me, but I would rather give some of my credit to him than be a petty thief of another man's glory. And Zúñiga sneers at these sincere feelings, this candour, this modesty. Oecolampadius is quite capable of holding his own against Zúñiga, yet if by chance he has made a mistake anywhere, it was unfair to attribute another man's lapse to me. In the same manner, if anything in the works of Jerome edited by the Amerbachs[27] offends him, he prefers to reproach me with it rather than them, although they are the acknowledged editors.

Indeed, if some error was committed by the typesetters – which is unavoidable even if you put Argus in charge of proofreading[28] – he blames it all on me. I would consider myself very impudent if I attributed to Zúñiga the fact that in his work one can frequently read *occiari*, *Battavus*,[29] and other slips of this kind – yet one comes across them so frequently that it is hard to believe that it happened by chance. And it is marvellous what fuss he raises on account of such trifles, how he raves against me, when he himself, the harsh critic, so often errs in matters in which not even a young schoolboy would err. For example, he censures what had been written by Paul in the Epistle to the Romans,[30] arguing that *ἐλλογεῖται* should read *ἐλλογεῖτο*, when *ἐλλογεῖτο* is a word unheard of in Greek. In addition, there is some material that is not relevant to me at all, yet is pursued by him at great length; some material that is so minute and frigid that it would appear to be suitable for

* * * * *

confessional question. They publicly criticized each other's doctrinal positions, but eventually reconciled (see Epp 2147 and 2196). In 1531 they once more collaborated on an editorial project, the translation of works of Chrysostom.

27 The edition of Jerome's *Opera omnia* appeared from the Froben press in nine volumes, Basel 1516, under the guidance of the Amerbach brothers, Bruno (1484–1519) and Basilius (1488–1535). Jerome's letters, which appeared in the first four volumes, were edited by Erasmus. See Ep 396.

28 Erasmus was aided in the proofreading task by Oecolampadius (see n26 above) and Nicolaus Gerbel (c 1485–1560), who taught history at the Strasbourg gymnasium from 1538 on. Erasmus complained that the two men had done a poor job of proofreading and overlooked many mistakes (Epp 417, 421).

29 The words should be spelled with one 'l'. For Zúñiga's spelling, see also below, n366.

30 Rom 5:13. See pp 89–90 below.

cooling down the thermal baths of Nero.[31] And while throughout the whole work he is 'laughing convulsively,' 'dissolving with laughter,' 'unable to control himself,' 'chuckling,' 'having fun,' and 'being amused' – yet, as if there weren't enough petulance in this – he has added marginal summaries in which Erasmus sleeps, snores, dreams, is blind, hallucinates, lapses, goes wrong by a whole world, is delirious, in which the Translator and Zúñiga triumph, while the Dutchman is trodden underfoot.[32] In these summaries everything is simple and straightforward, and magnificent promises hold out hope for the proverbial hen's milk,[33] whereas when you take the argument itself, it is often so full of problems and loopholes that the case resembles a physician who labels a box containing cream of beetroot 'The hands of the gods.'[34]

From time to time he calls me a Dutchman, and somewhere he adds rather scurrilously 'steeped in butter and homebrew'[35] – as though my nationality should be held against me, even if I had been born among the Bactrians and Sogdians,[36] or as though anyone could despise Holland, such as it is, whether you consider its famous and populous cities, its culture and civilization, its abundance in everything material, or its crop of gifted minds. That this is the truth, Zúñiga may, if he will, ascertain from Spanish merchants. Yet this kind of thinking should carry very little weight with educated men. For a Christian philosopher there is no Spaniard, Frenchman, German, or Sarmatian, there is only the 'new creature.'[37] All who serve the glory of Christ are members of the same nation, are brothers or whatever is closer than brothers.

Just as Zúñiga is rather impudent in the many claims he makes for himself, so he is most impudent in the many pronouncements he makes about me. For example: Erasmus has always been engaged in secular studies and has come to this task with unwashed feet, motivated by nothing but a thirst for vainglory; he, Zúñiga, has come to the task well equipped with all tools, with a simple and pure heart, motivated by nothing but a desire to help and

* * * * *

31 Mart. 3.25.4
32 Erasmus exaggerates, although Zúñiga does accuse him of "dreaming" and "hallucinating" (for example, in his notes on Matt 27:48, Gal 3:8, Acts 8:32, 1 Cor 14:21).
33 *Adagia* I vi 3
34 *Adagia* I i 6
35 Zúñiga in his note on Gal 3:8
36 The people of Afghanistan and Uzbekistan at the borders of the area Alexander the Great conquered were used proverbially to denote 'barbarians.'
37 Gal 6:15

to champion the truth which he saw oppressed, and this without a helper, as he boasts. But what would be more demented than to endure so much work, with no other goal than to harm the Translator and get a little glory for myself? What quarrel did I have with the Translator, whose name no one knows? Was there no other path to glory open to me, one less laborious and more direct? Zúñiga is equally impudent when he says that I rebuke the Translator everywhere in the most insulting terms and practically expel him from the circle of scholars, whereas what I find lacking in him is attention rather than skill, whereas I praise his translation in many places and on occasion even defend it against Valla and Lefèvre.[38] But what is even more impudent: he writes that I condemn the translation of the church while I loudly declare everywhere, 'to the point of frenzy,' as Plautus says,[39] that I am translating the text of the Greek manuscripts and am not completely in agreement with their reading; that, as far as I am concerned, the reading of the church remains intact and unimpaired; that this is presented for reading in private studies, not in churches.[40] And he also assumes, rather boldly, that the translation which the church now uses is Jerome's or certainly corrected by Jerome, when I prove this wrong with so many arguments in my *Annotations*, indeed when the facts themselves prove it wrong.[41] Since Zúñiga undertook to defend the Translator against me, who does not call him into court, I don't understand how he can be pardoned for abandoning his client in so many places, splendid orator that he is. For while he insists that the Translator's version is good Latin and pure, he passes over in silence the many obvious solecisms pointed out by me and the many passages obscurely or ambiguously rendered. Yet it is more modest to keep silence than to offer an inept defense.

After a preamble so grand that the notorious epic poet[42] could seem exceptionally modest by comparison, Zúñiga nevertheless leaves the verdict up to the reader in the end – provided the reader is skilled in Greek and Latin. But who would dare to disagree with a man who a little earlier made these claims for himself, saying:[43] 'If anyone is in a position to pass a verdict about such matters, I too have a right, for I have spent not a few years reading

* * * * *

38 On Valla, see nn2 and 3 above; on Lefèvre, n15.
39 Plautus *Aulularia* 2.5.10; *Adagia* IV i 70
40 See for example CWE 41 466 and Ep 46:88–102.
41 For Erasmus' view on the authorship of Jerome see, for example, Epp 337:810–26, 373:62–3, 843:21–6.
42 In his *Ars Poetica* 136, Horace refers to a poet who tried to treat the whole mythological cycle from the earliest times to the Trojan War in one epic.
43 A literal quotation from Zúñiga's preface

the sacred writings of the Old and New Testament in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin and have personally and with the greatest care compared the Hebrew and Greek texts of Holy Writ with the oldest Latin manuscripts. Thus apprised by years of reading and experience, I know very well – unless I am mistaken – what respect must be paid to the New Testament version used by the church.' Thus Zúñiga in his Asiatic style.[44] – 'What will this boaster offer that is in keeping with his big mouth?'[45]

Yet a suspicion enters my mind that the great Zúñiga was suborned by others to act out another man's play. Certainly, if you take away from him what he took out of the lexica and the notes of the most scholarly Antonio de Nebrija[46] whose well-deserved reputation I promote wholeheartedly, there will not be much left for Zúñiga to boast about. If he is the great man he wishes to be taken for, what possessed him, being such a hero, to lower himself to examine the trifles of Erasmus the Dutchman? For what is easier than to search for something to criticize in a large work? What is meaner than to go through another man's book, hunting for something to criticize? And what glory could he gain when I myself corrected in the second edition whatever was amiss in the first? Virgil exaggerated the valour of Turnus to make the glory of Aeneas' victory shine brighter.[47] Homer had Achilles fight, not with Thersites, but with Hector the great hero.[48] Zúñiga believes he can win a splendid victory by no other means than convincing himself that his contest was with a man of no importance – not unlike some silly women in their foolish jealousy who make out other women as ugly in the hope that thereby at last they themselves will appear beautiful.

Since Zúñiga is so full of good will toward himself and so full of ill will against me, it is inevitable – if he writes this in earnest – that he will be considered in some respects impudent, in others arrogant and a petulant writer. If this is how he amuses himself, let him again and again weigh whether men of authority would not consider such behaviour more becoming in a buffoon than a man dealing with Holy Writ, especially after such a splendid

* * * * *

44 That is, a flowery style

45 Horace *Ars Poetica* 138, referring to the epic poet's grandiose plans. See n42 above.

46 The *Tertia Quinquagena* (1516), a discussion of Hebrew terms by Elio Antonio Nebrija (1441/1444–1522), noted Spanish grammarian and collaborator in the Complutensian Polyglot.

47 See Virgil *Aeneid* 9.727–77.

48 See Homer *Iliad* 20.364–454; the character Thersites stands for a man who does not know his place (*Iliad* 2:240–2).

preamble. And this one character flaw seems to me more shameful than a hundred linguistic flaws. But now let me select some passages from the book itself, from which the reader may easily judge whether the result bears out the promises and whether Zúñiga knows as much as he thinks he does.

From the first chapter of Matthew

On some occasions I had pointed out that in my opinion Matthew had not written his gospel in Hebrew, or if he did, that Jerome had not seen the Hebrew text. I do not state this categorically but say that 'it seems more likely to me.'[49] And I proffer reasons in my *Annotations* which I need not repeat here. Zúñiga, however, casts into my teeth Origen, Augustine, and Chrysostom who think otherwise,[50] though none of them strongly advocates this view. For Origen says: 'This is the tradition of our forefathers'; and Augustine says: 'We hear that Matthew was the only one who wrote in the Hebrew language.' Finally, Chrysostom says: 'He is said to have written the gospel in Hebrew.' But, one may say, Jerome quoted some words from it in the letter to Hedybia and again in the letter to Damasus remarking on the term 'Hosanna.'[51] It is strange, then, that Zúñiga, whom nothing ever escapes that is written in any kind of good author, failed to quote the passage from the *Catalogue of Illustrious Writers* where Jerome clearly asserts that Matthew wrote his gospel in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew script. He says that a Hebrew manuscript was extant at that time in the library of Caesarea which Pamphilius the martyr set up. Moreover, Jerome himself had been given an opportunity to copy the book by the Nazarenes who used it in the Syrian city of Berea. Here I am aiding Zúñiga's cause. One will ask therefore how I can have the gall to disagree with Jerome. The principal reason is this: Although there are so many instances in which the aid of the Hebrew text was most necessary, Jerome nevertheless hardly ever adduces it. For what he adduces in the letters just mentioned, he quoted in such a manner that it could seem to have been taken from the Nazarene gospel.

* * * * *

49 In his annotation on Matt 8:23

50 Origen in Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.25.4 (but the sentence in question is not in Eusebius; it was added by Rufinus); Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 1.4 CSEL 33 4; Chrysostom *Hom in Matt* 1:5 PG 57 17.

51 Jerome in *De viris illustribus* 3; Zúñiga did in fact refer to this passage. According to Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-2 73), however, the passages quoted 'have no bearing on any gospel whatsoever, either canonical or apocryphal, but contain merely Jerome's own hypothetical (and absurd) retroversions from the canonical Matthew into Hebrew.'

Why, then, does he assert that he has seen a copy? I would rather the reader guess my thoughts than express them myself.[52] But lest there be an immediate outcry against me, 'O impudent man!', let us hear first what Jerome himself writes about this matter in *Against the Pelagians*, book 3.[53] He says: 'The following account is given in the Gospel according to the Hebrews which is written in Chaldaic-Syriac language but in Hebrew script, and which the Nazarenes use to the present day – the Gospel according to the apostles, or as many people conjecture, according to Matthew, which is also kept in the library of Caesarea.' So far Jerome. There is no question about the library, about the Nazarenes using it, about the Hebrew script, and about the title according to the opinion of the majority. There remains one problem: regarding the Chaldaic language. And the same Jerome writes in his commentary on Matthew 12 in this manner:[54] 'In the gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use and which I have recently translated from Hebrew into Greek and which is called by many the authentic gospel of Matthew' etc. From these words we gather that there were two books, though in the same library and written in the same script but in different languages, one of which was truly Matthew's, written in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew script, translated into Greek by an unknown translator, which Jerome only saw and described but did not translate, and another in the Syriac-Chaldaic language, but in Hebrew script, which Jerome himself translated into Greek. Since he frequently cites testimony from the latter, one wonders why he did not cite much more frequently from the former. One must wonder, moreover, why the Nazarenes favoured the Chaldaic[55] over the Hebrew one. Furthermore, if of the two books one was without a doubt Matthew's while the other was apocryphal, why does Jerome repeat so many times that the Chaldaic copy was thought by many to be Matthew's and authentic? Moreover, if Jerome had thought that the gospel which he copied was truly Matthew's, it would have been necessary to correct the remainder of the New Testament after the Greek original, and Matthew's gospel after the Hebrew. Origen would have used the same approach, for he was a man of scrupulous care, especially since he complains that the Greek gospels varied in many places and seemed to him corrupt. Finally, if Matthew wrote in Hebrew, how is it that his writings were neglected to such an extent and perished so completely

* * * * *

52 That is, that Jerome either boasted or was mistaken
53 *Contra Pelagianos* 3.2
54 In his commentary on Matt 12:13 CCL 77 90:366–9
55 That is, Aramaic

that even in Syria there was no more than one copy extant? I should add this too: While Zúñiga admits that Christ spoke, not Hebrew, but Chaldaic, the language then commonly spoken by the Jews, what possessed Matthew that he preferred to write in Hebrew rather than Syriac, that is, preferred to write in the language known to fewer men and different from that which Christ spoke? Eusebius of Caesarea mentions a gospel according to the Hebrews in the third book of his *History of the Church*, as he called it,[56] but he added that this gospel was not adopted by the church. He says nothing of the other copy. Furthermore, without prejudice to anyone's opinion, I suspect either that Jerome somewhere made use of popular opinion about so famous a book, especially when the matter itself demanded it, or that the other book was translated into Hebrew from a gospel of Matthew in Greek, just as so many Latin books have been translated into that language.[57] At present I shall add no further arguments. If anyone does not like my suggestion, let him enjoy his own views. As for the rest of what Zúñiga adds, let my helper[58] look after it – it is in any case a matter of small importance.

On the first chapter of Matthew [Matt 1:3]

I had indicated in my *Annotations* that I preferred *e Thamar* to *de Thamar* because it is not customary to say *suscepit liberos de illa* [he had children by her], though I was not unaware of the fact that a similar form of speech is found in some authors.[59] Here Zúñiga makes some prefatory remarks, beginning with a rhetorical commonplace against those who disregard subject matter and worry about signs,[60] and by this token condemns Erasmus, Lefèvre, Valla, and in the same fashion the many other 'forerunners' Erasmus had in this type of work. For this is how he talks, without realizing that his condemnation applies to both Jerome and Augustine. Jerome restored the New Testament and in his commentaries often discussed the specific shade of meaning of an individual term and, on occasion, also the correct form of expression, as for example when he somewhere approves of the term

* * * * *

56 *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.25, 27, 39

57 From the fourteenth century on, many Latin authors, among them Boethius and Thomas Aquinas, were translated into Hebrew. A fourteenth-century Hebrew version of Matthew, for example, was published by Sebastian Münster in 1537.

58 That is, Oecolampadius; see nn26 and 27 above.

59 That is, the construction *suscipere de* is not classical.

60 That is, words; Augustine contrasts signs and things in *De doctrina christiana* 1.2.2.

conspersio but rejects the term *massa* [for 'lump'].[61] What Jerome did everywhere, Augustine did frequently, and he even wrote some books on forms of expression in the Old Testament.[62]

Moreover, since I had undertaken the task of restoring the correct reading and turning the speech of the apostles into neat Latin – was I to keep silent about words when I had taken on this matter as my particular subject? Why does Zúñiga not by the same token condemn his friend Coronel – unless perhaps Coronel took care not to touch on the subject of words in his great dictionary?[63] If choice of words is of no significance, why is the unpleasant subject of grammar taught to boys in school? And how will words act as signs of things, if it does not matter what words you use in your speech? Indeed, if there is no convention regarding signs, one man cannot use words to signify to another what is on his mind.

But, [you may object], Augustine says it does not matter to one who knows the subject whether you say *inter homines* or *inter hominibus*.[64] Why then does Augustine himself resort to this mode of speaking? Augustine writes elsewhere that he prefers to say *ossum* rather than *os* when speaking of 'bone' rather than 'mouth' so that he might be better understood by the listener[65] – yes, but in speaking to the common people to whom he thereby clearly indicated the meaning 'bone,' for *os* is ambiguous for us. Indeed, there was a time when the awkward language of the gospel was more tolerable because the common people were still speaking Latin, though in a corrupt form, and at that time understood the familiar solecisms better than if the translator had rendered the text into pure Latin. Nowadays we are not dealing with the common people when we speak Latin, and it is in the interest of both the propagation and the reputation of the gospel teaching that it be transmitted in simple, yet pure and flawless, Latin. And we often see even the best biblical exegetes stumble, and textual corruptions frequently arise from passages that were not rendered into proper Latin by the Translator. For if the Translator had not produced the faulty translation *latuerunt angelis hospitio exceptis*, the copyist would not have taken offence and corrupted

* * * * *

61 In his commentary on Galatians 5:9 PL 26 429

62 That is, *Locutiones in Heptateuchum* CCL 33 379–472

63 Pablo Coronel (c 1480–1534) taught Hebrew at the University of Salamanca and was a collaborator on the Complutensian Polyglot. His dictionary, *Vocabularium Hebraicum atque Chaldaicum totius Veteris Testamenti* was included in volume VI of the Polyglot. Zúñiga praised Coronel in his annotation on Heb 7:2.

64 *De doctrina christiana* 2.13.19

65 Ibidem 3.3.7

Scripture, writing *placuerunt angelis hospitio exceptis*.[66] For one who discusses words does not neglect content but rather prepares the path for an understanding of the contents or at least effects that the meaning is poured into the minds of men through a more convenient medium.

And here again Zúñiga impudently assumes that the translation which the church now uses, has been revised by Jerome, whereas Jerome criticizes some words in his commentaries, and also indicates of others that they are superfluous or have a different meaning. If Zúñiga has not yet realized this, it is obvious that he was not as diligently engaged in perusing the books of the old orthodox writers as he boasts, but rather has examined certain passages cited by me, looking for something to slander and criticize.

Just as impudent is his assertion that all those who attempted to emend the holy books – which includes Jerome – had no other aim than to condemn and disgrace the old biblical exegetes and the text of the church. Even if this translation were the one revised by Jerome, in its uncorrupted form, as it was brought forth by himself, Jerome would not be so proud or peevish as to consider it a great insult if someone engaged in the same subject more diligently or more successfully. If my work is an insult to the old orthodox writers and the text of the church, why did Leo,[67] the supreme shepherd of the church, repeatedly give it his seal of approval?

Now from my words it will be evident that Zúñiga used a specious argument when he made Valla the author of the statement 'there is no difference between the prepositions *ex* and *de*,' whereas Valla does not deal in that passage with the rules of Latin idiom but rejects the distinction made by some theologians who explain that *de* must be used whenever the same substance is involved, *ex* whenever only the origin is meant.[68] This is a distinc-

* * * * *

66 Heb 13:2; *Latuerunt* (ie 'they have shown hospitality to angels without knowing it') is the correct reading. Both Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus in their annotations on the passage pointed out that some manuscripts had the corrupt reading *placuerunt* ('they were pleased to show hospitality to angels').

67 Pope Leo X had not praised the New Testament edition, but more generally Erasmus' 'exceptional learning.' He spoke of the 'renown of your published works … commended to us by the opinion of the most learned men' (Ep 519:4–7). In another letter, the pope had praised Erasmus' edition of Jerome: 'We shall look forward with a sort of agreeable impatience to the volumes of St Jerome and the New Testament' (Ep 338:27–8). The laudatory mention of the New Testament was, however, added by Erasmus in the published version of the letter!

68 Lorenzo Valla in his annotation on Matt 1:16. His *In Latinam Novi Testamenti interpretationem … adnotationes* were published by Erasmus (Paris 1505).

tion Chrysostom too rejects,[69] or at any rate does not regard as absolute. How is this relevant when I speak of Latin usage? If Zúñiga wants permission to replace *ex* by *de* everywhere, pray, would anyone tolerate phrases like *fugit de bello*, or *amat me de animo* instead of *amat ex animo*, or *cognovi de litteris tuis* instead of *ex litteris tuis*, or *non erit de re tua* instead of *ex re tua*?[70] While Zúñiga is at great pains here to demonstrate that *de* has the same force as *ex*, citing a few passages out of the Old Testament, he has so far been unable to find a good Latin author to prove his assertion. Yet I do not deny that it can be found, I merely state that it is not permitted in general and that it is rather unusual. I granted that Cicero said *audivi de patre meo*,[71] but hardly anyone striving after correct expression has dared to imitate him. Although I pointed this out very discreetly in one or two words, Zúñiga exaggerates this in his usual fashion, as if I had raged against the Translator, or rather, against Jerome, saying that he spoke Getic, not Latin.[72] My intention was not to retain anything that could offend lovers of pure Latin and I preferred what I knew would be less offensive. Someone might say, why did you change what was tolerable? I concede that one ought to change as little as possible in a translation designed to be substituted for the official text. But in this case the official version remains untouched; I am presenting my version to be read in private studies. Thus, it would have been better to change every detail since, according to Augustine,[73] a variety of texts is conducive to an understanding of Holy Scripture. If at one time in the future the leaders of the church decree to have a new official text, it will be much easier in the wake of my labour by which I have paved the way for such an enterprise.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 1:6]

Because the epithet 'King' is added in the genealogy to David's name (*τὸν βασιλέα*, with the definite article subjoined), I advise the reader casually and in passing to consider whether there is a special emphasis on the Greek article. For it is added in a manner that suggests that this David is being distinguished from another of the same name, who was not king. Here Zúñiga,

* * * * *

69 Chrysostom in his *Homiliae* PG 59 57–8

70 The rejected phrases are idiomatically incorrect.

71 *De oratore* 3.133

72 'Getic' in the sense of 'barbarian.' In antiquity, the Getae inhabited the region of modern Bulgaria and Romania.

73 *De doctrina christiana* 2.12.17

that perceptive fellow, finds that I busied myself with the works of Lucian[74] and never even had the faintest taste of Holy Scripture. I am asking you, dear reader, can any man be more impudent or more petulant? Granted there is no other person by the name of David in Holy Writ – but could there not be another who is not recorded in Scripture, especially when it is beyond dispute that a great many Hebrew books have perished? Furthermore, I did not mean to say that there actually was another, but rather that one ought to inquire into the meaning of the article *ton*. For the author would have clearly indicated that David was king, even if he had omitted the article and said *David βασιλέα*. Moreover, since I added an alternative conjecture,[75] why does Zúñiga seize on the first one? For what he adduces from the *Ordinary Gloss*[76] does not solve the problem of the article. It is a fine thing, however, that he even divines that Matthew wrote *Hamelech* in Hebrew.[77] And this frivolous argument Zúñiga could not present without a harsh and insulting preamble.

Note 3 [on Matt 1:6]

After such magnificent promises, after such fierce railing, observe what charge he finally fastens on me. He says that I translated 'Solomon' whereas in Hebrew it is also correct to say 'Salomon' – a fact of which I was not ignorant and which I never denied. But if it is wrong to translate 'Solomon' – as it is consistently pronounced in Greek – why does the Latin Translator escape censure when he translates Jesus' name according to the Greek rather than the Hebrew pronunciation, especially when there are people who believe that there is some mystical indication of the divine nature in the Hebrew letters themselves?[78]

* * * * *

74 In his annotation on this passage, Zúñiga wrote 'If Erasmus had put more effort into the study of Holy Scripture than into the works of Lucian … he would never have written in this fashion.' Erasmus had translated some works of Lucian, a Roman satirist shunned by conservative readers as promoting atheism. See Erasmus' catalogue of works, Ep 1341A:204–39

75 Ie that the article had been added for emphasis

76 The *Ordinary Gloss* was a standard medieval commentary on the Bible, begun by Anselm of Laon around 1100 and completed by others around 1150.

77 Ie that the article was based on the conjectured Hebrew word, which includes the article

78 For speculations on the symbolic value of the letters in the Hebrew name, see for example the Church Father Irenaeus (PG 7 789A) and, in Erasmus' time, Johann Reuchlin, *De verbo mirifico* (Tübingen, 1514) 3.12.

But soon Zúñiga is more civil and almost forgives me for writing in my annotation 'Bersabee' for 'Bethsabee.'[79] He thinks that Oecolampadius, my helper, must be called to task – and from this weighty argument the sagacious fellow concludes that neither I nor Oecolampadius know Hebrew. If Zúñiga had any decency he would have imputed the error to the typesetters, not to Oecolampadius, unless he is asking us to impute to him personally the fact that we find in his book *occiari* for *ociari*, *Battavus* for *Batavus*, *excussum* for *excusum*,[80] and not a few other things of this kind. He can see at any rate that this mistake was corrected in the second edition, even without a helper, lest he think I am so completely ignorant of Hebrew that I cannot understand that much. And what a wonderful example of modesty when he adds that he himself is able to pass judgment on Hebrew without a helper.[81] Who is arrogant enough to assert that he does not need help from anyone? Even Hercules cannot do without a helper – Zúñiga alone needs no helper but is more than self-sufficient. What sort of petulance is it to persecute Oecolampadius at every opportunity, a man who must be respected for his upright life no less than for his knowledge of theology and languages? Perhaps Zúñiga will soon find out that Oecolampadius is not to be despised – if he considers Zúñiga worthy of his pen, that is.[82]

Ibidem, note 3 [on Matt 1:11]

In transmigratione Babylonis [in the Babylonian transmigration]:[83] I admit that the meaning of the Translator can be understood by those who know history; nevertheless I point out that the matter can be made clearer if one translates 'when the migration to Babylon had taken place' or 'when they had migrated to Babylon' or, as I translated at that time, 'in the transmigration to Babylon'; and I add that it was clearer to say 'in Babylonian exile' or 'captivity.' Although I show many ways in which awkwardness of expression

* * * * *

79 Ie Bathsheba, Uriah's wife (see 2 Sam 11:3)

80 See n29 above.

81 In his note on the passage Zúñiga writes that Erasmus' 'Theseus, Oecolampadius, must be called to task because he did not point this out to his dear Erasmus … I, who can judge about these matters without the help of a Theseus, have seen more than once that both men are ignorant of Hebrew.' For Oecolampadius see n26 above.

82 Oecolampadius refrained from writing against Zúñiga.

83 The Latin phrase is ambiguous because the genitive can be either subjective or objective. It can therefore mean either 'migration to Babylon' or 'Babylon's migration.'

can be avoided, Zúñiga nevertheless criticizes only the one I put into the text, passing over the rest. But since I published this work with the proviso that I did not want the notes separated from the text, Zúñiga, being a civil and prudent man, should have imagined that what was in the notes was in the text, choosing what he thought best.

As for his assumption that *transmigratio* expressed the meaning of the Greek word *μετοικεσία* better than *demigratio*, he does not prove at all what he so valiantly asserts. The way *μετάθεσις* and *μετάφορα* are handled is not a universal principle of translation,[84] or else *μετανοέω* would be *transsentio* in Latin, and *μεταπέμπω transmitto* and *μεταστρέφω transverto*. Even if *μετα-* had no other meaning in Greek than *trans-* in Latin, one would nevertheless have to consider Roman idiom. Those who are sent to deserted islands are said to be 'deported' not 'transported'; they are being 'relegated' there not 'translegated.' Thus, while I know that *demigrare* is an approved and commonly used word in Latin, I have my doubts about *transmigrare*, and I preferred what was more certain. But [you may say that] a certain ambiguity remains in my translation, for it could be taken to mean that Jechoniah and his brothers were born during the journey itself – I admit that much, and for this reason I changed it in the second edition before I could guess that Zúñiga would appear and raise a tragic fuss about such trifles.

But in the version of the Vulgate translator the phrase was in many ways ambiguous or nonsensical. For how does 'Babylonian transmigration' indicate the point of destination any more than 'Palestinian transmigration' indicates the point of departure – not to fall back on the argument that *μετοικεσία*, the noun derived from the verb, could be taken in the active or passive sense. But here Zúñiga calls me ridiculous for judging others by my own level of intelligence, since it cannot be taken in any other sense but the passive. Although this is in itself incorrect, let us grant what Zúñiga assumes: accordingly we shall think that Babylon has been transferred elsewhere when we hear *transmigrationem Babylonis*. He adds this comparison: 'When we say *Aegypti captivitas*,' he says, 'we mean that the Jews were captives in Egypt' – as if someone said *captivitas Troiae*, when he means to say that some Greeks had been prisoners in Troy rather than that Troy itself had been captured. The world would have remained ignorant of this splendid argument, had Zúñiga not appeared on the scene. Finally, he divines in this case too what Matthew wrote [in Hebrew]. I feel sorry for Zúñiga who has wasted his talent, pen, paper, and time on trifles of this kind; I feel sorry for

* * * * *

84 Ie the Greek prefix *μετα-* is not always translated by Latin prefix *trans*.

the reader who spends good hours on such nonsense; I feel sorry for myself for being obliged to read or rebut these foolish arguments. Yet Zúñiga could not point out this nonsense without adding one or two insults.

Ibidem, note 4 [on Matt 1:23]

The Greek phrase *ἐν γαστρί ἕξει* was rendered by the Translator *in utero habebit* [she will have in her womb]. Because it seemed that Latin ears were rather unaccustomed to this expression, I translated *virgo erit praegnans* [the virgin will be pregnant]. It is, moreover, an ambiguous expression,[85] for one can have *in utero* what has been consumed, not only what has been conceived – hence the joke in Athenaeus,[86] where a physician asks a woman whether she has anything *in utero*, and the mime's reply was: 'What should I have *in utero*, when I haven't eaten for three days?' Here Zúñiga accuses me of translating the meaning, not the words. So I did, expressing the meaning in Latin and more clearly too. If it is never permissible to depart from the wording, the Vulgate translator will have to be called into court many times, for he often departs from the Greek wording without cause. 'But,' says Zúñiga, 'if you had to depart from the Greek wording, you should have taken it from the Hebrew which [in Greek] is *λήψεται* rather than *ἕξει*, that is, "she will receive."'[87] Wonderful – but I would have merely shifted the problem, not escaped it. Not to mention here that Zúñiga who tells us what the Hebrew text has, based on the authority of Jerome,[88] does not understand the passage he cites because it is corrupt. Yet I pointed out in a few words that the passage is marred – a subject on which you will see some comments in the second edition, more in the third, and something also in the apologia in which I answered Lee.[89] For I showed that Jerome read 'has,' not 'will have.' And although 'has' is a verb in the present tense it nevertheless corresponds to a verb in the past, that is, 'has conceived.' Similarly, in the phrase 'received gifts for men' found in the Psalms,[90] the verb is in the past tense yet denotes

* * * * *

85 The Latin *uterus* usually means womb, but may also more generally denote the belly.

86 *Deipnosophistae* 10.20 453 A.

87 Zúñiga is referring to the Hebrew of Isa 7:14 ('she will receive'), which is cited in Matt 1:23, but in an altered form 'she will have.' He argued that Erasmus should have retained Matthew's wording.

88 In his commentary on Isa 7:14 CCL 73 104:73–7

89 CWE 72 82–7

90 Ps 67 (68):19

an action in the future. For he who has received something for distribution has not yet distributed it. This has escaped Zúñiga's sharp eyes.[91] As for his critical remark that the Hebrew word is not as I indicated, relying on Oecolampadius, I have already given my reply to Lee,[92] who first brought this accusation against me.

And when I had added in passing that Jerome seemed to have spoken lightly when he said that the Latins call holy things *alma*, using the same word as the Hebrews, Zúñiga suspects that I said so because Jerome prefaced his remark with 'And to give the Jews something to laugh at.'[93] From this he concludes that I did not understand Jerome's words. He concludes that I made a mistake and read hurriedly without attention. But what I in turn could conclude from Zúñiga's words, I shall not say for the moment. I shall only state this much, dear reader: I do not say [that Jerome spoke] lightly because he spoke of the laughter of the Jews but because the thing does not seem quite plausible to me. For first of all *alma* does not mean the same in Latin as in Hebrew. If there is any agreement, I think it is either coincidence that in so many thousands of words a few by chance have the same meaning (just as it is a coincidence that we share with the French some words – sometimes with a different meaning, for example, when the Picards say '*cout*' for 'hot,' while the same word [*koud*] in our language means 'cold'); or else we adopted it, just as the Greeks did with many Latin words taken over into Greek, like *κουστωδία*, *σουδάριον*, *πραιτώριον*.[94]

From chapter 2, note 1 [on Matt 2:1]

Following the authority of Greek manuscripts, which are in surprising agreement on this point, and on the authority of old Latin manuscripts, I had pointed out that one ought to read *Judea* not *Jude*. But, [you may say], Jerome disagrees. I was aware of this. Jerome, however, does not assert this view; he says 'I believe.'[95] It is Zúñiga who asserts it. As for the rest, I refuted Jerome already in the first edition, but without naming him – [Zúñiga would have noticed that, were he as keen-eyed as he presents himself.] Jerome at any rate thinks that *Judea* in this passage can be taken for the whole region of the

* * * * *

91 Literally 'Zúñiga, that Lynceus,' a reference to the mythological figure of Lynceus, proverbial for his sharp sight (*Adagia* II i 54)

92 CWE 72 87

93 In his commentary on Isa 7:14 Jerome cites Hebrew loan-words, which in Erasmus' opinion are merely homophones. In his annotation on the passage, Erasmus said that Jerome 'seems to have spoken in jest rather than seriously.'

94 Words used in the New Testament, taken from Latin *custodia, sudarium, praetorium*

95 In his *Comm in Matt* 2:5

Jews, whereas I think that *Judea* is put here for a part of Juda. If Zúñiga had understood this, he would not have written 'if Erasmus had read Jerome … .'

A little later he accuses me of a faulty memory because I wrote that in the Book of Judges another Bethlehem is mentioned, situated in Galilee. If Zúñiga were endowed with that civility and good will that becomes true scholars, he would have attributed the error – one little word[96] – to the typesetters, or the scribes, rather than to my poor memory. But you were present, someone will say, when these pages were printed. I admit it, but this type of mistake is not easily caught by proofreading, nor are errors in numbering, unless perhaps Zúñiga has all of this under perfect control. But let him put the worst construction on it, in which case one cannot suspect anything worse than that in copying the passage from the commentaries of Jerome, some of which concern the present passage, others the fifth chapter of Micah,[97] my pen slipped, especially when he had just referred to the Book of Judges in the latter passage. However the mistake came about, I am grateful to my friend Zúñiga for pointing it out, for I would perhaps not have noticed it myself. Here, then, let Zúñiga have a laurel crown as his reward!

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 2:16]

Ac mittens Herodes [And Herod sending]: Since the verb is *ἀποστείλας* in Greek, which indicates that men had been sent with instructions (not with letters, which is expressed in Greek by a special word, *ἐπιστέλλειν*). I showed that the translation would have been clearer if he had said 'after the executioners (or servants, or guards) had been sent out.' 'What if he sent none of these' says Zúñiga, 'but rather royal edicts through couriers?' But tell me, please, are couriers not servants? And how can edicts arrive without the aid of servants?

Then he notes that I translated *sustulit* rather than *occidit*, in order to convey the meaning of the Greek word *ἀνεῖλεν*. *Sustulit*, he says, is an ambiguous word,[98] as in *sustulit hic matrem, sustulit ille patrem* 'One took off [killed] the mother, the other took off [took upon his shoulders] the father'[99] – I suspect that Zúñiga criticized this passage, partly to have an opportunity to recite this witty verse aimed at Nero, written by his favourite author,

* * * * *

96 Ie writing 'Judges' for 'Joshua' 19:15

97 Jerome also comments on Mic 5:2.

98 The word can mean both 'take away' and 'kill.'

99 Suetonius, *Nero* 39, referring to the emperor Nero, who killed his mother, and to the mythological hero Aeneas, who carried his old father when the family fled Troy

Poliziano.[100] He says, moreover, that *sustulit* is a word few people will understand. First of all, if ambiguity must always be carefully avoided, the verb *occidere* [to kill] is just as ambiguous, for someone 'kills' when he murders, or 'kills' us when he bothers us a great deal, as in 'Some men kill me with their eagerness to prepare weddings that are too holy.'[101] And I think that those who are not versed in secular literature will more readily understand *sustulit* to mean 'slew' than 'accepted from his wife' or 'took upon his shoulders.'

Chapter 3, note 1 [on Matt 3:2]

Poenitentiam agite [repent]: At one time I had rendered *μετανοεῖτε* [repent] by *poeniteat vos* at another time by *resipiscite*. I have found *poenitentiam agite* only once, in Pliny's *Letters*,[102] but with a genitive added. I myself was not quite pleased with *poeniteat vos*. But Zúñiga denies that this passage has ever been cited in any form other than that given by the Translator. Let him decide for himself whether this is true. One thing is certain: if I am not allowed to differ in any point from the translation of our forefathers, Zúñiga will have cause to bring accusations against me everywhere. But this was my very purpose: to translate differently, hoping that the reader would thereby gain considerable insight.

After going on raging against me in this manner and hurling insults, Zúñiga accuses me of having given the text a ridiculous meaning by saying *poeniteat vos quoniam appropinquavit regnum coelorum* [repent because the kingdom of heaven is at hand] – as if Matthew had asked them to regret that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. It is Zúñiga's interpretation that is ridiculous. Whatever the problem, does it not remain the same in the old translation, *poenitentiam agite quia appropinquavit*, etc? And especially since it is the Translator's practice to use *quia* for *quod*.[103] How much leisure he must have to waste with such nonsense both his own time and another man's effort!

* * * * *

100 Passage unidentified, but Erasmus may well have wrongly attributed Suetonius' verse to Poliziano.

101 Terence *Adelphoe* 899–900

102 *Ep* 7.10.3. Erasmus' point is that the phrase *poenitentiam agere* (repent) requires a genitive of object in good Latin. In subsequent editions of his New Testament, Erasmus therefore used the phrase *poenitentiam agite vitae prioris,* repent of your former life.

103 *Quia* means 'because'; *quod* can mean either 'because' or 'that.'

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 3:7]

I changed the translation *genimina viperarum* to *progenies viperarum*, adding that I was not sure whether *genimina* could be found in standard Latin authors.[104] At once Zúñiga casts into my teeth Jerome,[105] who spoke in this manner somewhere in translating the Old Testament. I certainly place Jerome among the standard authors as far as theology is concerned, but I do not accept him as an unerring authority on language matters. 'But,' says Zúñiga, 'the ancients said *geno* for *gigno*, for this is what Priscian teaches, citing Varro's *Andabatae* and Lucretius.[106] By this token *genimen* can be derived from *geno*, just like *regimen* from *rego*.' I won't waste time on what one might say; let Zúñiga show what he found in standard authors. It would have been most impudent of me had I wanted to use the obsolete verb *geno* on the authority of archaic authors, and authors who wrote in verse at that. It would have been even more ridiculous to use a word derived from it which cannot be found in any author, especially when other words are available that are both good Latin and in common use. I certainly wish the word *genimen* could be found and were sanctioned by popular usage. I ask you, dear reader, consider whether this stuff corresponds in any way to those magnificent and daunting claims of Zúñiga.

Ibidem, note 3 [on Matt 3:8]

Facite fructus dignos poenitentiae, [in Greek] *καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας* [bring fruits worthy of repentance]: I show that the Greek phrase is ambiguous because the genitive 'repentance' can be connected with either 'fruit' or 'worthy,' and my translation has even Zúñiga's approval, but he denies that the former meaning [fruits of repentance] is possible because *dignus* [worthy] cannot be used absolutely, without adding what you are worthy of. On the

* * * * *

104 The argument between Zúñiga and Erasmus is based on a confusion. The Vulgate reads *progenies*, which Erasmus retained, although he commented in his annotation on the passage that *genimina* (which appears in Luke 3:7) is not found in classical authors. Zúñiga wrongly inferred that Matthew had *genimina* and that Erasmus had changed it to *progenies.* Erasmus, in turn, did not check his text and therefore failed to discover Zúñiga's error. He therefore engaged with Zúñiga's irrelevant criticism.

105 Jerome at Job 31:12; but the word is only found in Christian authors, whereas Erasmus used classical Latin as his standard.

106 Priscian, ed. Eduard Keil *Grammatici Latini* vol 2 528:25–7. Erasmus accepts neither the usage of Varro, which he regards as archaic, nor that of Lucretius, which is poetical.

contrary: It is correct to state that the object is often understood, as in *O digno conjuncta viro // si credere dignum est* [O mate of a worthy husband // if it be worthy to believe][107] and *et digna et indigna dixit* [he said worthy and unworthy things] and *beneficium dando accepit qui digno dedit* [he received a favour who did a favour to a worthy man]. If someone says 'he was received with harmful blows' and another replies *ut dignus est* ['since he deserves it'], I think it would be good Latin. And this construction is more frequent in Greek than in Latin. It is impudent therefore of Zúñiga to teach the contrary. Granted, it is true that *dignus* in Latin is sometimes found joined with a genitive case, but it is certainly exceedingly rare and therefore should be avoided in Gospel language, which ought to be plain and easy. And it is a fine thing that in order to convince us that *ἄξιος* takes the genitive case in Greek, he makes up his own example – *ἄξιος εἰμι τούτου τοῦ πράγματος* [I am worthy of this deed] – when another phrase was at hand which would have suited this nonsense so much better: *ἄξιος οὐδενός* [worth nothing].

From chapter 4 [on Matt 4:1]

Since I had found *zabulus* for *diabolus* in Hilary's commentary on Matthew,[108] I was in doubt whether the copyists should be held responsible. Here Zúñiga, the splendid logician, reasons that I have read nothing either in Hilary[109] or in other authors except for the purpose of excerpting the odd thing from them. What is the basis for Zúñiga's conjecture, if not his own practice? Nor did I say that it can be found in Hilary in this passage only, indeed in the second edition I show that it also occurs elsewhere in the same author; nor did it escape my attention that it is found also in Cyprian, whose complete works I have revised to the best of my ability.[110] Zúñiga conjectures that *zabulum* comes from the Hebrew *zebul* – how much this figment is worth he may see for himself. In Greek at any rate it is *διάβολος*, nor is *zabulus* ever found for *diabolus* in Holy Scripture. In my opinion it is more probable that *zabulus* is derived from the Greek word, the 'o' having been changed to 'u' in Latin;[111] unless someone prefers to ascribe this to the ignorance of scribes,

* * * * *

107 Virgil *Eclogues* 8.32

108 Apparently Erasmus had seen a manuscript of Hilary's commentary on the passage with the reading *zabulum* (the modern edition in PL 9 928 reads *diabolum*).

109 In fact, Erasmus edited the works of Hilary (Basel 1523). See Ep 1334.

110 Erasmus edited the works of Cyprian (Basel 1520); modern texts, however, have only the form *diabolus*. *Zabulus* is found, for example, in the fourth-century Church Father Lactantius *De mortibus persecutorum* 16.

111 Zúñiga incorrectly derived it from Hebrew *zebub* (fly). Erasmus' derivation is correct.

for I have found *zabolus* written in some manuscripts. For that *za* is sometimes put for *διά* in Greek is too well known to need proof here. Girolamo Aleandro,[112] a leading light in the knowledge of the three languages, pointed this out to me – lest I appear to cheat anyone of his credit. O grave annotation, so nobly matching the grand preambles of Zúñiga!

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 4:24]

What the Translator had rendered as *daemoniacos* [possessed by demons],[113] I preferred to translate *syderatos* [lunatics], for it is *σεληνιαζομένους* in Greek.[114] But I did so only in the first edition and changed it in the second.[115] Nor did I condemn the Translator's version. Zúñiga explains to us that *syderatus* is one thing, *lunaticus* another. I know that there was once an argument among learned men about this word, nor do I see why those who are struck by the power of the stars cannot be called *syderati* – and this is the [literal] meaning of the Greek word. As for the rest, I have no intention to argue about this at great length with Zúñiga, especially since I changed the word of my own accord in the second edition.

From chapter 5, note 1[on Matt 5:13]

Si sal evanuerit [if the salt lost its flavour]: Here I preferred *infatuatus fuerit* [became insipid] to *evanuerit* because one says *evanescere* in Latin when something is removed from sight, or when something of light texture is no longer seen. *Evanescit, evanescunt* is said of smoke or ghosts. Secondly, I preferred the masculine form *salem* to the neuter. Zúñiga tells us that it is used in both genders. I was not unaware of this, nor did I deny it, but I preferred the masculine because it is both more common and found in less obsolete authors.

* * * * *

112 Girolamo Aleandro (1480–1542), an Italian scholar knowledgeable in Greek and Hebrew, made a rapid career in the church. He was successively secretary to Etienne Poncher, bishop of Paris, Erard de la Marck, bishop of Liège, and Cardinal Giulio de Medici; from 1519 he was head of the Vatican library. In 1520 Aleandro was sent to Germany and the Low Countries as a legate to implement the papal bull against Luther. Erasmus and Aleandro had shared quarters in Venice when they were young scholars. In 1522, Luis Vives suggested to Erasmus that it would be politic to give the now powerful Aleandro an honourable mention somewhere in his works (Ep 1256:76–7).

113 The Vulgate has *lunaticos.* It is of course possible that Erasmus saw a Vulgate text with a different reading.

114 The Greek (like the English term 'lunatic') is derived from *σελήνη*, moon. Similarly the Latin *sideratus* is derived from *sidus*, star.

115 Ie he changed it to *lunaticos.*

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 5:27]

In the first edition I had translated *non adulteraberis* [you will not commit adultery], preferring it to the Greek loanword *moechaberis* – though the change itself could have been ascribed to the correctors of the press since I make no mention of it in my *Annotations*. I changed it at any rate in the second edition, rendering it by *non committes adulterium*. Zúñiga denies that *adulterari* is a correct verb form unless taken in the passive sense. Indeed it is true that *adulterari* means 'to be corrupted' just as *adulterat* means 'corrupts' – nor did this escape my attention. But I used *adulterari* as we use *poetari, rhetoricari, juvenari, palpari* – in the medium voice.[116] Yet I cannot at all agree with Zúñiga when he thinks that in Gellius *adulterare* means exactly the same as *adulterium committere*, for if I am not mistaken, one must supply a pronoun. *Illa te, si adulterares* (supply: *eam*), *digito non auderet contingere* [She would not dare touch you, if you committed adultery]. But apart from the fact that this is a small matter and one that I could blame on others, it has already been changed by me three years ago, as I said, so that if the new version is better, I owe no thanks whatsoever to Zúñiga.

From chapter 6 [on Matt 6:11]

Panem nostrum quotidianum [our daily bread]:[117] Since there is nothing here that argues against me, I have no reason to reply. Nevertheless, I am somewhat obliged to Zúñiga for pointing out that I should have put 'here' [*hic*] for 'elsewhere' [*alibi*] – although I suspect I had written 'somewhere.' [*alicubi*][118] Since I was in a hurry then, I did not have time to look up the passage, or perhaps as I was about to do it, I was called away elsewhere. Yet I noticed it in the third edition.[119] If Zúñiga does not believe me, I shall gladly acknowledge his service to me, even though he is a harsh adviser, and perhaps when his works appear,[120] I shall requite his favour with interest.

* * * * *

116 That is, as a deponent verb, which is passive in form but active in meaning

117 Erasmus changed the Vulgate *supersubstantialem* to *quotidianum* in conformity with the Latin wording of the Lord's Prayer.

118 In his original annotation on the passage, Erasmus had erroneously written 'which the Translator renders elsewhere as *supersubstantialem*.'

119 The third edition was in preparation at this time (September 1521). It was published in March 1522.

120 In his annotation on Acts 4:27 Zúñiga announced that he was preparing another work against Erasmus. He published *Blasphemiae et impietates* (Rome 1522).

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 6:13]

What remains here but to decree a triumph with white horses[121] for Zúñiga? I had said that the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer is found in all Greek manuscripts but is expounded by no one except Vulgarius.[122] Zúñiga notes that it is also explained by Chrysostom in his *Homilies*.[123] And lest we distrust him, he quotes Chrysostom in Greek, then adds Anianus' translation.[124] Oh, the man's remarkable diligence! And from this he concludes how lacking in diligence I was in reading the authors. My work was completed in Basel at great speed within approximately five months. Nor was I free to devote myself completely to it. Jerome, printing at the same time, occupied most of my time. And Zúñiga is surprised if by chance I did not come across a certain passage in Chrysostom, which does happen sometimes because the pages are inserted in the wrong order. I encountered this problem also in the Greek commentaries of Theophylact on the epistles of St Paul, and in the Latin translation of Chrysostom. Perhaps it so happened that Chrysostom did not come to mind at the time, for Vulgarius was sufficient. Yet I think I have given a satisfactory answer on this point to Lee[125] who first brought this up against me, but too late, since in the second edition I remembered even Chrysostom – so that in this respect at least I owe nothing to either man.

From chapter 8 [on Matt 8:23]

The Translator rendered the Greek *καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* by *et ascendente eo in naviculam* [while he boarded the little ship]. To preserve the time sequence, I translated *et cum esset ingressus navim* [and when he had boarded the ship]. Secondly, to prevent anyone from thinking that there was

* * * * *

121 As described by Suetonius *Nero* 25; also *Adagia* I iv 21

122 Here and elsewhere Erasmus calls Theophylact 'Vulgarius.' Erasmus had used a manuscript of Theophylact's Greek commentary on the gospels (AN III.15, now in the University Library at Basel). The beginning of the text is damaged, so that the name of the author is no longer legible. The cover of the manuscript, however, designated the author 'Vulgarius' ('The Bulgarian') since Theophylact (1050–1107) was Archbishop of Ochrida in Bulgaria. Erasmus took the designation 'Vulgarius' to be the author's name, a mistake he corrected in the second edition of the New Testament (1519).

123 *Hom in Matt* 19, 6

124 Erasmus owned a 1517 edition of Chrysostom's *Homiliae*. Homilies 1–8 had been translated from the Greek by Anianus in the fifth century; the remainder by George of Trebizond (1395–1484).

125 CWE 72 90–2

some mystical meaning in the diminutive 'little ship'[126] I point out that the word in the passage was *πλοῖον* [ship], not *πλοιάριον* [little ship], though the evangelists seem to use these words inconsistently. Zúñiga tells us that the Translator's version was 'not bad.' Agreed – nor did I say that it was bad. 'For,' says he, '*ἀναβαίνω* means *adscendo, καταβαίνω descendo*, and *ἐμβαίνω inscendo*.' Then what does *συμβαίνω* mean? *Conscendo*, I suppose? [127] But joking aside, what is Zúñiga's purpose here? If *ἐμβαίνω* means *inscendo*, then the Translator should not have rendered it by *ascendens* (for he was not translating *ἀναβάς*) but by *inscensa navi*.

In addition, I pointed out in passing that *conciliabulum* [council, assembly] was neither a diminutive[128] nor did it always have a negative sense, since it is found in Jerome in a positive sense. Zúñiga teaches that it has a negative sense in Jerome.[129] Who will deny it? 'Meeting,' 'convention,' 'synagogue,' and 'council' all have a negative meaning when you add 'of Satan.' But Zúñiga challenges me to indicate where St Jerome has used it in the positive sense. And I in turn am surprised that Zúñiga who has spent whole centuries on reading all the sacred authors should ask this question of me. Yet I can now put my finger on one passage. In the letter to Gerontia about single marriage Jerome writes in this manner: '… which, according to John's Apocalypse, ought to be called synagogues of the devil rather than councils [*conciliabula*] of Christ.'[130] Let Zúñiga go now and deny that I have looked at anything in the ecclesiastical authors, when he has learned this much at any rate from the Dutch fool.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 8:29]

Zúñiga seems to delight in the kind of joke that the Greeks call *ἀπροσδόκητον* [unexpected], since he decided to begin all over again with

* * * * *

126 The "little ship of Peter" represented the church in medieval iconography. Erasmus eliminated the diminutive (characteristic of popular Christian Latin) because he preferred classical to medieval usage.

127 Zúñiga makes a point of noting that the Greek prefixes *ἀνα-*, *κατα-*, and *ἐν-/ἐμ-* should be rendered by the Latin prefixes *ad*, *de*, and *in*. In that case, Erasmus jokes, *συν-* should be rendered by *con*, meaning that it was ridiculous to point out a general (though not universal) rule.

128 The standard form is *concilium.* The ending *-bulum* is generally, but not always, diminutive.

129 Zúñiga had pointed out several passages in Jerome, but Erasmus claims that in each case the negative meaning was produced by the added genitive 'of heretics,' 'of malignant men,' 'of vices.'

130 Jerome *Ep* 123.11

a preface, writing in this manner: 'Indeed,' he says, 'what business does Erasmus have with Holy Writ, which he seems to have touched only yesterday or the day before? One must know, however,' etc. On reading this, does one not expect that he will presently reveal some extraordinary and dangerous error of mine in interpreting Holy Writ? And again, on hearing 'one must know, however,' does one not expect some recondite doctrine to be drawn from the innermost shrine of the Scriptures? Now listen to a thought hardly worth a penny. I briefly criticize the Translator for having translated *Quid nobis et tibi Jesu*, since in translating he preferred to speak Greek rather than Latin as far as the turn of phrase goes.[131] For in Greek *τί μοι καὶ μακροῖς αὐλοῖς, τί κυνὶ καὶ βαλανείῳ* [What do I have to do with loud trumpets? What has a dog to do with a bath?][132] are correct and elegant phrases but not so in Latin. Therefore I had added: 'Indeed, what business does the Translator have with a Greek idiom?' Here Zúñiga thinks he is making a wonderfully witty retort. 'Indeed, what business does Erasmus have with Holy Writ?' Then he shows that the same idiom which is found in Greek is also found in Hebrew. Granted that this is so – but if an idiom is the same in Greek and Hebrew, does it follow that Erasmus has 'only yesterday' begun to touch on Holy Writ? In what point was I wrong here? I did not deny that this idiom is found in Hebrew – I denied that it is found in Latin. On this point, I think, Zúñiga is in agreement with me, but he prefers to think that even the other evangelists who undeniably wrote in Greek, drew this kind of idiom from the Hebrew rather than from the Greek. This does not concern me either, though why would it be necessary to draw it from another language when it was available in Greek? Even if the evangelists had been ignorant of Hebrew and had known only Greek, they would nevertheless have spoken in this manner, I think. But did the Latin Translator render it in this form because the Hebrews spoke thus? O grave annotations! Who was dreaming here, Erasmus or Zúñiga? It makes me somewhat suspicious to see that Zúñiga is so much in favour of the Hebrews[133] that he wishes everything owed to them when the matter requires nothing of the sort at all.

* * * * *

131 The phrase in the Vulgate is a literal translation of the Greek phrase, which is however unidiomatic in Latin.

132 *Adagia* I iv 39

133 Here as in his replies at Luke 3:1 and 1 Cor 7:8, Erasmus hints that Zúñiga was of Jewish descent. This was meant to be a pejorative remark. Though generally preaching tolerance, Erasmus was not entirely immune to the prejudice of his age against Jews.

From chapter 10 [on Matt 10:35]

Et nurum adversus sacrum suam [And the daughter-in-law against her father-in-law]: Since it is *νύμφη* in Greek I translated *sponsam*: 'the bride against her father-in-law.' Zúñiga shows that *νύμφη* can mean either bride or daughter-in-law in Greek, and I was well aware of this. But the woman who is your daughter-in-law is the bride of your son, so that in this passage it makes no difference to the meaning whether you say 'bride' or 'daughter-in-law.'[134] I did not criticize the Translator, but rendered the same meaning in a different form, and did so by using a word more common than *nurus*.

From chapter 11 [on Matt 11:17]

Lamentavimus et non planxistis [we lamented and you did not beat your breasts]: Thus the Translator; I had translated *lamentati sumus*, adding: 'Whoever said *lamentavimus*?' Here Zúñiga cites the ancient grammarians to prove that some words which are now deponent verbs were used by archaic authors in the active voice and vice versa, for example: *puniuntur* for *puniunt*; *sacrificantur* for *sacrificant*; *contemplo* for *contemplor*; *auguro* for *auguror*; *crimino* for *criminor*; *frustro* for *frustror*; *patio* for *patior*; *moro* for *moror*; *demolio* for *demolior*; and more of this kind. It was after this fashion that the Translator said *lamentavimus*, Zúñiga suggests. This is a fine way of defending the Translator, if he had no better excuse for saying *lamentavimus* than for saying *criminavimus* and *demolivimus*. This is how this excellent patron, and such a boaster when it comes to Holy Writ, looks out for the Translator, his client. He adds another similar explanation: 'In the Psalms,' he says, 'we find *et virgines eorum non sunt lamentatae* [and their virgins were not lamented]'[135] – as if it followed that someone spoke correctly because he spoke in this manner rather frequently, or as if someone spoke the truth because he frequently repeated the same lie. It does not immediately follow that *populo* [I ravage] is good Latin prose and should be generally used, because we read *populatas urbes* [ravaged cities] in the passive. Even less relevant is what Zúñiga adduces from the Hebrew; in fact it argues against him. For when Jerome changed the voice of the verb and translated *virgines eorum nemo luxit* [no one

* * * * *

134 A weak explanation. Erasmus himself had correctly observed in his annotation to the passage: 'With reference to the husband *νύμφη* means bride, with reference to the parent of the husband it means daughter-in-law.'

135 Ps 77 (78):63. This is a mistranslation. The meaning is 'the virgins were not celebrated [with wedding songs],' that is, remained unmarried.

mourned their virgins],[136] it is obvious that he avoided *lamentatae sunt*, a verb form that is poor Latin. Meanwhile my friend Zúñiga, who defends putting *puniuntur* for *puniunt*, showed little consistency when he could not bear my writing *adulteraberis* for *adulterabis*.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 11:25]

Confiteor tibi, Pater, Domine coeli et terrae etc [I give thanks to you, Father, Lord of Heaven and earth]: Here Zúñiga brings a twofold charge against me, because I translated *ἐξομολογοῦμαι* [I confess, or thank] by *gratias ago* [I give thanks] and because I translated *νηπίοις* [childlike, or simple-minded] by *stultis* [foolish] rather than *parvulis* [childlike]. Yet he does admit that I have read Jerome, who notes that *confessio* does not always refer to the act of acknowledging a sin, but also to one of praising and thanksgiving. 'But,' he says, 'in that passage Jerome discusses, not the appropriateness of the word, but its meaning.' I quite realized this and for this reason I had noted that it was a Hebrew idiom, for in that language 'confession' means a vote of thanks; and I indicate that I translated *gratias ago* to make the expression clearer for those who know only Latin. What did I do wrong here? I rendered the meaning, and I rendered it more clearly and without equivocation. Can this be called an 'inappropriate' translation? For that is Zúñiga's complaint. Is it an appropriate translation when you use a Latin word in a sense it does not convey to Latin speakers? For that is what Zúñiga praises in the Translator.

As for my translating *stultis* instead of *parvulis*, the fellow – all charm and wit – carries on against me in a wonderfully humorous manner: 'It need not surprise us,' he says, 'if in the following he renders *νηπίοις*, that is, *parvulis* [childlike] by *stultis* [fools] since he wrote such a splendid praise of Folly. For the book which Erasmus published some time ago under the title *The Praise of Folly* is a cause célèbre,[137] a most authoritative work and not unworthy of the panegyrist. This was the reason, I think, why he translated this passage thus, wishing to derive from it the authority to corroborate his own views.' Here is Attic eloquence[138] for you, dear reader! Do not his words appear very similar to the words of Thraso: 'Are you fierce because you are the governor of fierce beasts?'[139] Let Zúñiga beware, lest in the eyes of serious

* * * * *

136 *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* Ps 78. For the correct meaning, see preceding note.
137 *The Praise of Folly* was published in 1511.
138 See n14 above.
139 Terence *Eunuchus* 415. Thraso, a character in Terence's play, is the proverbial braggart soldier.

scholars I seem to have treated more skillfully of folly than he himself treats of evangelical wisdom.

After this charming preamble, he adds once again 'One ought to know, however.' And what does he teach us? That *νήπιοι*, properly speaking, means 'little ones' or 'infants,' metaphorically speaking, 'fools.' He has taught us an important point, but one even *νήπιοι* know. But he proves, citing Chrysostom,[140] that in this case the words are addressed, not to fools [*μωροῖς*] but to simple people [*νηπίοις*] who know no conceit. What conclusion does Zúñiga draw from this? That *νήπιος* means foolish only in the positive sense? But Hesiod[141] uses it in the negative sense, saying *νήπιε Πέρσα* [foolish Persian], as does Homer,[142] saying *ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω* [when the deed is done, even a fool understands]. And does *μωρός* always have a negative connotation? Paul used it in the positive sense: 'God has chosen the foolish things in the world' and 'because of the folly of God.'[143] The same Paul preaches Christ to the gentiles as folly [*μωρία*] and calls the foolishness [*τὸ μωρόν*] of God wiser than man's ingenuity.[144] And a little before that he had contrasted the folly of his preaching with the wisdom of the Scribes and philosophers. Here Paul did not recoil from the word *μωρός*.[145] For just as in Holy Writ wisdom is ambiguous, so is folly. Both *νήπιοι* and *μωροί* receive praise and blame. Just as a little earlier Paul had called those wise who were not truly wise but had wisdom according to the world, so he calls his disciples fools, not because they were truly fools, but because they were regarded as fools by worldly standards. The Translator, using *parvuli* or *infantes* [little ones or infants] in his translation, first of all ruins the striking contrast and secondly does not escape the difficulty he wanted to avoid. For the apostles were not 'children' in the literal sense; they were 'children' as far as malice was concerned, indeed they were 'children' in the common estimate of men, for they were neither experts in the law nor teachers of philosophy. In my judgment, the word *stulti* is obviously more suitable than the word *parvuli*, yet I replaced *stulti* with *parvuli* in the second edition, as if I guessed that Zúñiga would appear on the scene and turn it into a slanderous accusation.

* * * * *

140 *Hom in Matt* 38 PG 57 429
141 Hesiod *Works and Days* 286, 397, 633
142 Homer *Iliad* 17.32
143 1 Cor 1:27
144 1 Cor 1:25
145 1 Cor 1:21

Ibidem, note 3 [on Matt 11:30]

The Translator had rendered this phrase *iugum meum suave est* [my yoke is pleasant]; the Greek has *χρηστόν*. I preferred *iugum meum commodum est* [my yoke is easy], without however condemning the Translator's version. Zúñiga, who does not deny what cannot be denied, namely that *χρηστόν* means sometimes 'good,' sometimes 'easy,' tries to prove that it can be interpreted as 'pleasant.' Let him prove that it can be interpreted as 'pleasant.' Let him prove it as much as he will, he still won't prove what he claims in the marginal summary: that *suave* is a better translation than *commodum*.

As for what he adduces from Chrysostom,[146] 'that the yoke of virtue is sweet and pleasant [*ἡδὺς καὶ κοῦφος*],' does not prove at all that *χρηστόν* means 'pleasant,' since Chrysostom's explanation goes beyond the scriptural text. I agree with Chrysostom as far as the substance of his statement is concerned; the only question here is whether *χρηστόν* means 'pleasant' and whether it means 'pleasant' rather than 'easy.' For a yoke can be easy and not at all bothersome, yet in such a manner that it gives no pleasure, and it can be light because it is no burden, yet at the same time it may be no pleasure either. And if whatever is easy delights, it does not immediately follow that 'delightful' and 'pleasant' mean the same thing. For the fact that Jerome,[147] following the Vulgate text, reads *suave iugum* is no argument against me.

From chapter 12 [on Matt 12:17–18]

I had written that I am inclined to conjecture that Jerome's commentaries on Matthew, as we have them, have been abridged in places; that this was also the case with his commentaries on the Psalms which, apart from being abridged, also contain much foreign matter.[148] For the commentaries on Mark have nothing of Jerome in them except his name in the title.[149] Here Zúñiga rails against me with fierce insults, crying out that it is most impudent to suspect that anyone dared to do violence to the books of the sacred doctors. The dear man! As if falsifiers had not dared to commit every crime possible against the books of the most learned men or as if it had not

* * * * *

146 *Hom in Matt* 38 PG 57 433

147 *Comm in Matt* CCL 77 87

148 Erasmus is referring to the pseudonymous *Breviarium in Psalmos* (text in PL 26 821–1270). The genuine commentaries were discovered in the nineteenth century (text in CCL 72 163–245).

149 Erasmus is correct. The commentary was written by Cumeanus in the seventh century.

been at one time common practice and even considered desirable to make summaries of authors!

He shows that Jerome calls these commentaries 'concise.' I admit that they were brief compared to those in which he expounds the prophets or the Epistle to the Ephesians, yet nothing prevents the original commentaries from having been fuller once than they are now. As for Jerome saying that he had written more fully in his commentaries about certain matters, whereas in those we have he barely touches on them in a few words, Zúñiga makes his escape thus: Jerome did not say 'more fully explained in the brief commentaries,' but 'more fully explained in the brief commentaries *and* in the letter to Algasia.'[150] And in that letter he does treat the matter fully. How much this evasive statement is worth, I leave others to judge. If Jerome had wanted to express himself in the sense postulated by Zúñiga, he would have said, in my opinion: '… a matter about which I have said something in the brief commentaries, but which I discuss more fully in the letter to Algasia.' As far as I am concerned, I proffered nothing more than a conjecture. Nothing, moreover, prevents the commentaries on the Psalms from having been brief yet having been made even briefer by abridgment, though in some places there is much superfluous discussion.

Finally, so as not to agree with me on anything, Zúñiga ascribes to Jerome even the commentaries on Mark that are bandied around under Jerome's name. 'The Aristarchus[151] of our times,' he says, 'is deceived by a similar misconception – unless he thinks that nothing can be a work of Jerome's that does not breathe secular eloquence and echo Tully [Cicero] and Livy everywhere.' Let Zúñiga read those commentaries and then deride the 'Aristarchus of our times.' For I did not judge them to be the work of another on the basis of style alone – yet I do not condemn the work.

From chapter 14 [on Matt 14:10]

Et decollavit Ioannem [and he beheaded John]: I had translated *ἀπεκεφάλησεν* [beheaded] by *amputavit caput*, not condemning the Translator, indeed admitting that the verb *decollare* is found in Seneca in his satire on the death of Claudius,[152] but questioning whether Seneca had used it satirically there. Zúñiga shows that it is found in other authors as well and elsewhere in the

* * * * *

150 Jerome *Ep* 121.2–5

151 Zúñiga uses the metaphor sarcastically. Aristarchus (217–145 BC) was considered the perfect critic and became proverbial as such.

152 Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* 6.2

same Seneca. I attested to this myself in the second edition. Nevertheless, I was not wrong in using the translation *amputavit caput*. Zúñiga will admit that the verb *decollare* is ambiguous[153] at any rate. While no blame was attached to the Translator in this case, observe Zúñiga's indignant conclusion: 'What insolence is this,' he says, 'indirectly to censure the translator of old, to slander him, sink his teeth into him, and hiss him off the stage, as if he had spoken like a barbarian everywhere?' Here you have an orator who is forceful, but not pleasant!

Ibidem, note 2 [on Matt 14:34]

Here Zúñiga is gleeful because Jerome wrote 'If we knew what Genezareth meant in our tongue, etc'[154] and I asked 'What does he call "his" tongue? The tongue of the Syrians among whom he lived?' Zúñiga explains that he was referring to the Latin tongue. Nor did I affirm anything to the contrary.

I added that the meaning of the Hebrew word was apparently unknown to Jerome because he said 'if we knew.' Zúñiga contends that it was perfectly well known to him since he was living among the Syrians and since he interpreted this passage accordingly in the mystical sense. On the contrary: Jerome does not interpret the word in that passage. For if Genesar or Genezareth is generally explained as *ortus principium* [first beginning] or *initium nativitatis* [beginning of birth], I do not see how Jerome's words relate to this etymology, for he says: 'If we knew what Genezareth meant in our tongue, we would understand how Jesus, using the allegory of the apostles and the ship, delivers his church from persecution and shipwreck and guides it to shore, giving it respite in a most tranquil harbour.' Did Jerome for the sake of discretion conceal the knowledge which he should have imparted? For this appears to be Zúñiga's meaning when he writes: 'He says "if we knew" out of modesty.'

From chapter 18 [on Matt 18:24]

Since the Translator gave the rendition *decem milia talenta* [ten thousand talents], I merely pointed out that this was a violation of Latin grammar – the meaning was left intact. Zúñiga in his marginal summary claims that

* * * * *

153 The literal meaning of the word is 'to take something off someone's neck,' that is, to unburden.

154 *Comm in Matt* CCL 77 126

this phrase is good Latin and, citing Valla,[155] produces an insipid argument showing that this form of speech is somehow defensible by saying that *decem milia talenta* stands for *talenta entia decem milia*. Then he shows that Jerome cited Judges, chapter 8 thus: *quindecim milia viri manserant*.[156] No one denies that this kind of phrase can be found throughout Holy Scripture, but Zúñiga will only carry off the palm if he can cite an example out of a standard Latin author – from a passage that is not suspected of corruption. I suspect that in antiquity numbers were generally denoted by signs and for this reason scribes often put *milia* for *mille*.

On the same chapter, note 2 [on Matt 18:28]

Et tenens suffocabat eum, *καὶ κρατήσας αὐτὸν ἔπνιγεν* [and holding him, he took him by the throat]: Since *κρατεῖν* does not simply mean 'hold,' but hold a prey on which one has laid hands, I had translated *et iniecta manu* [and laying hands on him]. Secondly, since *suffocare* in Latin means to kill by throttling, whereas Matthew seems to speak here of one who wishes to send a man to prison or drag him into court rather than kill him, I translated *ἔπνιγεν* by *obtorto collo trahebat* [dragged by the scruff of his neck]. Zúñiga disapproves of this – why, I cannot understand. 'Obtorto collo,' he says, 'is not in the Greek text.' What of it? The meaning is implied. 'We don't read,' he says, 'that he wanted to drag the man into court or any place else.' Agreed – but it is clear from what follows, 'and he cast him into prison until he should pay.' It would not be absurd if he dragged him off to prison after he had been convicted in court.

For some reason, my friend Zúñiga is also indignant because I presume to apply here what I have read in Seneca and in the letters of Jerome.[157] In fact, I read this in Cicero,[158] and I do not think it inappropriate to explain the meaning of the evangelists on the basis of Cicero's words.

* * * * *

155 Valla *Elegantiae* 3.4. Quoting this passage, Zúñiga omitted the fact that Valla called this phrasing 'indefensible.'

156 That is, Jerome cited the Vulgate version of Judges 8:10.

157 Zúñiga may be referring to Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* 11.6 and Jerome *Ep* 117.5.1, where the phrase *obtorto collo* (by the scruff of the neck) occurs, but Erasmus does not cite those authors in his annotation.

158 Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 21.59

From chapter 21 [on Matt 21:37]

Verebuntur filium meum [They will fear my son]: Here I point out that in the Latin texts *forte* [perhaps] was added although it was not in the Greek texts. Zúñiga is more inclined to suspect that it was omitted from the Greek texts. But this passage was earlier on slanderously attacked by Lee. In my reply to him I amply demonstrated that 'perhaps' is neither found in the Greek exegetes nor read by Jerome.[159] If anyone is interested, let him obtain the information from that source so that I do not waste my time here repeating the same things over again.

On the same chapter, note 2 [on Matt 21:42]

A Domino factum est istud [this is the Lord's doing]: I show that in Greek *factum* [doing] and *admirabile* [marvellous] cannot but refer to the stone and the keystone. Zúñiga denies this and prefers the explanation that the feminine gender was put for the neuter according to Hebrew custom, because Syriac lacked the neuter gender. Granted that this be true, why would the Translator want to follow Hebrew usage rather than Greek? And why did he do so only in this one place in the New Testament? But be this as it may, it would certainly have been fair to acquit me of the charge since I followed the authority of great men: Origen, Chrysostom, and Jerome.

I shall not be reluctant to add here Origen's words in *Homily* 19, in so far as they serve as corroboration in this matter.[160] 'And this stone,' he says, 'was given by God as a gift to the whole edifice and a wonderful keystone in the eyes of those of us who can see it with the eyes of our mind.'

The Latin translator of Chrysostom[161] rendered it in the form in which we read it in the Vulgate. But my impression is that in Chrysostom the pronoun applied to the keystone which united two greatly disparate nations in one and the same religion. He writes thus: 'And they see that nothing in them is against God but completely accepted and dear, and what was made by God was wonderful and miraculous: He added a stone' etc. If you compare this with what follows, dear reader, you will see that Chrysostom is speaking of the stone, although the translator or perhaps the scribe, following memory, muddled the context. For Chrysostom hints that the teachers of the Jews

* * * * *

159 See Erasmus' reply to Lee, CWE 72 104–8.

160 Origen *Hom in Matt* 19 PG 13 1511–2, under 'vetus interpretatio'

161 Chrysostom *Hom in Matt* PG 58 641–2. The Latin translation was by Georg of Trebizond (1395–1484).

wanted to build, but without the stone (Christ) which was to connect the two nations. This is, however, merely a supposition of mine based on conjecture – I would make a firmer pronouncement if I had access to the Greek text.[162] One thing is beyond doubt: Theophylact[163] interpreted it thus: the keystone was made and the keystone is marvellous.

How Jerome translated it from the Hebrew is not quite clear since it is agreed that a great part of this book was corrupted by scribes who thought they were knowledgeable, and the texts do not even agree among themselves. It could have happened, moreover, that he added from memory the words 'it has been made' and 'this is marvellous.' Even granted that it was translated in this manner by Jerome, it is still possible to relate 'this' to 'head,' that is, Christ. Nor is it necessary to relate it to the preceding clause. Jerome, at any rate, interpreted it thus explaining Psalm 117:[164] 'And it is miraculous in our eyes. Not in the eyes of those who reproached him, but in ours who raised him up by believing in him.' Thus far Jerome. Moreover, whether you apply the pronoun to 'stone' or 'head' or 'keystone,' the meaning is the same and the reference is to Christ.

Although I based my annotation on so many authoritative writers and although the meaning accords well with our text, there is Zúñiga exaggerating my 'inextricable' error, seeking this solution in the Hebrew idiom: 'The Hebrews,' he says, 'used the feminine gender since they lacked the neuter.' An example of this was the text of Joshua 3: *in hoc scietis*, which [literally translated from] the Hebrew is *in hac scietis*. And in Psalm 40: *in hoc cognovi* for *in hac cognovi*. Furthermore, in Psalm 26 the Translator even retained the Hebrew gender: *unam peti a Domino, hanc requiram*. This is the gist of Zúñiga's view. Granted that this is perfectly correct, it has no other effect than to make us realize that what we have in the Vulgate edition is one possibility of expressing and translating the Greek. It does not follow that it must be translated thus, since it yields a better meaning when we apply the pronoun to 'head' or 'keystone,' that is, Christ, as did the most approved exegetes.

This being so, although there is no problem as far as the meaning is concerned and although I followed the authority of the greatest men, observe what grave accusation Zúñiga brings against me. In his marginal summary he puts 'A very serious mistake of Erasmus in the Hebrew language.' And

* * * * *

162 The complete Greek text of Chrysostom's *Homilies* was published only in 1603. Erasmus' conjecture is not borne out by the modern text PG 58 642A.

163 Theophylact *Enarr in Matt* PG 123 381–382C

164 Ps Jerome *Breviarium in Psalmos* PL 26 1257C

again in his short preamble he says: 'Ignorance of the Hebrew tongue very often prompts Erasmus to make inextricable errors.' Indeed, Zúñiga's unrestrained tongue often prompts him to show unbecoming and unseasonable petulance.

From chapter 22 [on Matt 22:16]

I had written as follows in my brief note: 'As for the rest, by "Herodians" he means the soldiers of Herod, a proselyte whom Augustus had put in charge of the Jews to collect tribute from them in the name of the Roman emperor.'[165] In this context Zúñiga says: 'The Herodians in this passage are not the soldiers of the proselyte Herod, the first of this name, who obtained the command in Judaea with the help and support of the Romans, as Erasmus in his ignorance of Holy Writ assumed. For that Herod died when Christ was still a small child and living in Egypt.' I ask you, dear reader, what is this desire for maligning? Did I say that this Herod was Herod, the first of this name? And on what grounds did Zúñiga assume that I made this assumption?

He goes on to say that I made a mistake also when I wrote that this Herod was put in charge of the Jews for the purpose of collecting taxes. 'No,' he says, 'he was made king.' If a king is imposed, and imposed for the purpose of collecting tribute, is he not 'put in charge'? If a king is imposed on a province, is he not 'put in charge' of that province? If Zúñiga had wanted to add a historical explanation, could he not have done so without pursuing me with groundless insults? Especially when I had taken the content of my note from Jerome's commentary.[166] And I took no more than was sufficient for my purpose. Jerome says that Herod was the son of Antipater. Why, then, did Zúñiga prefer to quarrel with me rather than Jerome?

From chapter 26 [on Matt 26:31]

The words in my *Annotations* that gave offense to Zúñiga run as follows: 'In this matter either I am dreaming or Jerome has made a mistake – admittedly he was a man of supreme learning, of matching eloquence, incomparable sanctity, but he was undeniably a man.' You see, dear reader, that I preface my disagreement with Jerome with elaborate praise and an expression of respect. Now listen to Zúñiga and note how impudently he turns everything

* * * * *

165 Erasmus is suggesting that this was Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea from 4 BC to 39 AD, rather than King Herod I (74–4 BC).

166 Jerome *Comm in Matt* on 22:16 CCL 77 202–3 referred to Herod as 'King,' however.

upside down in his usual fashion. 'Oblivious now of that great promise,' he says, 'he does not scruple to accuse Jerome of having made a mistake so that he himself might appear more astute and more learned in interpreting Scripture. But if there was something somewhere in Jerome that was not well put, Erasmus should have stood by his promise – either to smooth over the error or justify it or cover it up[167] – rather than aim, of all holy doctors, at Jerome and purposely stage a fight with him. [That this was Erasmus' aim] is obvious from many passages in his *Annotations*. But what sort of duel can there be between Hercules, the slayer of monsters, and a weak little man who can hardly bear to listen to the din of arms?' Thus far Zúñiga.

I bow to no one's authority with greater respect than to Jerome's. And I think so highly of him that some people even made difficulties for me and wrote to say that I am unfairly biased in his favour;[168] and this man dreams up some sort of Herculean heroes, monsters, clashing arms, war, and duels. And then he sings Jerome's praises, borrowing something from the eulogy with which I celebrate his name in more than one place, except that I speak with a zeal and flow of words quite different from Zúñiga's here. Compared to me, he will appear a rather cold and tight-lipped eulogist. Soon he returns to me: 'And Erasmus,' he says, 'treats such a man like a commoner, talks idly, and has no qualms to contradict him everywhere.' And after this irrelevant (but according to Zúñiga, magnificent) preamble he turns to the subject matter.

Regarding the text of the prophecy 'strike the shepherd, and the sheep shall be dispersed':[169] Jerome[170] interpreted these words as the words of the prophet asking God to strike the shepherd. I prefer to attribute the speech to God, in the sense in which it is also adduced by the evangelist. To make the reason for my preference clear to the reader, I shall add here (to save myself some work) the passage from the third edition of the New Testament. I say: 'For if someone studies the passage in the prophet more carefully, he will realize that there is no need, and that it is in fact awkward, to attribute the words to the prophet. "Awake, o sword, against my shepherd, against the

* * * * *

167 Zúñiga is paraphrasing Erasmus' stated intention in his *Apologia* not to criticize men 'commended by their erudition and distinguished by the holiness of their lives' but rather 'to make light of an error or excuse or conceal it' (CWE 41 474).

168 The Ingolstadt professor of theology Johann Eck (1486–1543), a determined Catholic apologist, in Ep 769:97–103

169 Zech 13:7–8

170 Jerome *Epistolae* 57.5 CSEL 54 514. This letter is sometimes cited as *De optimo genere interpretandi* (On the best way of translating).

man who is my associate, says the Lord of hosts." And these words are certainly attributed to God, since these words are added: "Strike my shepherd and the sheep will be dispersed." These, too, are the words of God, addressing his sword. If anyone wants to twist it another way, he is certainly hampered by what follows: "and I shall turn my hands against the little ones." And what is immediately subjoined is an even clearer argument against such an interpretation: "and they will be in all the land, says the Lord."

For the express purpose of showing that some things in the Hebrew text differ from the Septuagint translation or the quotations of the apostles, Jerome[171] in his book *De optimo genere interpretandi* [On the Best Way of Translating] adduces, among others, this passage from Zechariah, distinguishing the speakers in a manner that suited his context. But in the commentaries[172] in which he expounds the passage in the evangelist he phrases his opinion in such a manner that he almost seems to recant what he wrote in the book *De optimo genere interpretandi*. "This," he says, "is expressed differently by the prophet Zechariah and, if I am not mistaken, is spoken by the prophet to God: *strike your shepherd*." As for his corroborating the meaning by referring to Psalm 60,[173] which agrees with this interpretation ("for they persecuted those whom you have struck"), even granted that the writer of the Psalm meant what Jerome says he did, this does not oblige us to change the person of the speaker. Since it is agreed that the first part of the prophecy ("awake, o sword, against my shepherd") is spoken by God the Father, and if we attribute what follows soon afterwards ("strike my shepherd," etc) also to God, the meaning remains the same, namely, that Christ was struck by the Father who had ordered his sword to strike – for he "strikes" who hands someone over to be struck.

As for the rest, Jerome in expounding the passage in the prophet[174] diverges even further from his own interpretation and attributes the whole speech to the Father. To make this clearer I shall quote his own words. "One must not think," he says, "that this testimony is taken from the other passage because in the gospel God says that the shepherd was struck by him, whereas in the present passage we read that the order was given to his sword

* * * * *

171 See preceding note.

172 Ie on Matt 26:31 CCL 77 252. In Letter 57, Jerome attributed the words 'strike the shepherd' to God; in his commentary he makes the prophet the speaker. He did note, however, that the ascription of the words to God in Matthew was a misinterpretation.

173 Actually Ps 68:27

174 Jerome *Comm in Zech* 13:7–9 CCL 76A 875

and blade: *Strike my shepherd and the sheep will be dispersed*." Thus far Jerome. You see that "strike my shepherd" are evidently the words of the Father giving the order to his sword, not the words of the prophet beseeching him. You see that there is no mention of the interpretation Jerome had proposed in the book *De optimo genere interpretandi*, even though it would have been much to the point to explain it here.

What inconsistency, then, is there in Matthew? The words differ, but the content is the same. For whoever says to his sword "strike," indicates that he wishes to strike soon, and thus Matthew, omitting some words, expresses the meaning: I shall strike the shepherd. Indeed, Matthew also omitted the possessive pronoun, whereas the prophet says "my shepherd." The pronoun itself invites us to attribute the speech to the Father rather [than to the prophet]. For he calls his "own shepherd" the only shepherd worthy of God, whereas others have different shepherds among whom are men of such character that the herd would be better off with them struck dead.

But our accuser is triumphant, teaching us that in the holy books the person of the speaker is sometimes abruptly changed. There was no need to learn this from him, when I myself so often attest to this practice in my books. But in this case there is no cogent reason for changing the speaker. And it appears that Jerome changed his mind.'

This is what I wrote in the third edition, and from these words, I think, it is obvious to the reader that I do not boldly disagree with Jerome. For the facts themselves show that I do so with due respect.

From chapter 27 [on Matt 27:48]

More than thirty years ago, as a young man, I read Plutarch's *Lives of the Leaders*.[175] And I was under the impression that I read there that vinegar was given to Antony by Cleopatra that he might die of his wound more quickly. Zúñiga notes that in that passage wine was mentioned, not vinegar.[176] This much I owe to Zúñiga. Let him prepare a triumphal chariot and applaud himself because he reread (or rather: read) the passage indicated by me and found 'wine' instead of 'vinegar.'

* * * * *

175 An unusual way of referring to Plutarch's work, usually cited as 'Parallel Lives' or 'Lives of Famous Greeks and Romans' (*Vitae parallelae, Vitae virorum illustrium Graecorum et Romanorum*)

176 Zúñiga is correct. The passage is in Plutarch *Anthony* 77.

From the first chapter of Mark [on Mark 1:2]

Ecce ego mitto angelum meum [Behold, I send my angel]: I had modestly noted that Jerome[177] might seem to have misremembered when he said this testimony was found at the end of Malachi, when in fact it is at the beginning of chapter 3.[178] The whole book consists of four chapters, and for this reason it would appear to be in the middle rather than at the end. Zúñiga answers that the fourth chapter is so short that, together with the third, it barely takes up a third of the whole work. Granted – but is it customary to call 'at the end' what is a little past the middle? And I add a conjecture indicating the reason for Jerome's lapse of memory: at the end of the whole prophecy there is a similar prediction which is also taken to refer to John.[179] How could I have expressed this more respectfully than by saying 'he might seem to have misremembered'? Yet Zúñiga in his index says 'Erasmus is talking idly,' and in his discussion, 'Erasmus accuses Jerome.'

From chapter 3 [on Mark 3:17]

Boanerges, quod est filii tonitrui [Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder]: In this case Zúñiga preferred to pick a fight with me when he should have dealt with my helper. '*Erges*,'[180] he says, 'does not mean thunder but sound or tumult or noise. One should read Banerrem, for Boanerges is a corrupt form, according to Jerome.'[181]

First of all, what I set down is the explanation given in the book *Interpres Hebraicorum nominum* [Explaining Hebrew Names] by an unknown author.[182] And it may be the case that Hebrew Banerrem is Boanerges in Chaldaic and Syriac.[183] Moreover, what is it that Jerome calls 'corrupt'? The fact that Syriac diverges from Hebrew? The evangelists often use words of this kind, and perhaps Christ always used this dialect, which was most familiar to the common people. Besides, he also pronounced 'corruptly' the words of the Psalms 'My

* * * * *

177 Jerome *Ep* 57.9 CSEL 54 518
178 Mal 3:1
179 Mal 4:5: 'Behold, I shall send you the prophet Elijah before the coming of the day of the Lord.'
180 Zúñiga in fact cited the Hebrew word *regesch* (tumult).
181 Jerome, *Liber interpretationis Hebraeorum nominum* PL 23 889–90; in the following Erasmus refers to it as *Interpres Hebraicorum nominum*.
182 Versions of this resource (see previous note) appeared in many Bible editions. It is an alphabetical list of Hebrew names with brief etymological explanations.
183 The etymology of Boanerges has not been established.

God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' when on the cross.[184] The Greek texts [of Mark 3:17] agree at any rate. If the evangelist wrote in this manner, it ought not to appear 'corrupt' in our eyes, for the evangelist wrote down what Christ said. Yet nothing prevents us from interpreting *fremitus* [loud sound] as *tonitrus* [thunder]. For in this sense Homer calls Jove *ἐρίγδουπος* [literally, loud-sounding] and *ὑψιβρεμέτης* [literally, sounding on high].

Furthermore, I cannot see why Zúñiga is indignant with me here for preferring to follow the authority of the evangelists rather than that of Jerome. If Zúñiga wanted to add something here out of his own researches, he could have proffered it in a fair manner, without insult. Otherwise it was far preferable to appear less learned than appear to suffer from the vice of malice.

From chapter 5 [on Mark 5:41]

Tabitha cumi [arise, girl]: I had indicated right at the beginning of my annotation that the Greek has *Talitha*, not *Tabitha*. Having said this in advance (a fact Zúñiga suppresses) I propose in passing, as is my right as commentator, that one ought to consider whether in this case *Tabitha* might be the proper name of the girl, as in Acts chapter 9.[185] Nothing prevents the girl from having by chance the proper name Girl, which will remain the same after she is no longer a girl. The consensus of Latin manuscripts also influenced my view somewhat. And at that point at any rate I was not very keen on changing the Vulgate translation, especially the text of the gospels, so that I sometimes did not collate whole pages not so much because I was lazy and did not care, but because I was overwhelmed by a tide of work.[186]

As for my adding that *Tabitha* in Hebrew means 'look up' or 'raise your eyes,' I wrote this no doubt on the advice of Oecolampadius.[187] If it is true – for Zúñiga does not disprove it – it does not go against the reading, but simply notes a fine point regarding a word that has many meanings, as is often the case. For example, 'Peter' is the name of a man but at the same time means 'rock' and, divided [into syllables], 'Son!' and 'Trojan!'[188] And

* * * * *

184 Matt 27:46 and Mark 15:34, quoting Ps 22 (21):2

185 Acts 9:40

186 In Ep 809:73–4, however, he explains that he was reluctant to make changes in the Vulgate text 'in order not to annoy over much those men who are so quick to find fault.'

187 A doubtful interpretation, which Erasmus omitted in later editions

188 A bizarre example of homonymy. The Latin word *Petrus* means 'rock.' In Greek, if the word is divided into the syllables 'Pe' and 'Tros,' it could be interpreted as 'Son! Trojan!'

there are other interpretations of this kind. For I proffered this for the sake of making my point.

As for Zúñiga saying that the evangelist translated *Tabitha* as 'girl' – he should remember that he argued earlier on that Matthew wrote in Hebrew.[189] If that is so, this cannot be the translation of the evangelist.

What I have said so far is enough in my defense, I think. What remains I leave up to my helper whose lack of experience Zúñiga ought to blame rather than mine. Nevertheless I have changed a few things in this annotation in the second edition. Here at any rate I heartily applaud Zúñiga's candour, for he does not conceal the source of this information and of many other things which he uses to attack my work, namely the great lexicon and the *Quinquagenae* of Elio Antonio Nebrija,[190] whose praises Zúñiga cannot sing so fully that I would not want to add even more praise in accordance with the man's merits. So praiseworthy is Nebrija's upright character and the effort he made on behalf of the humanities that I gladly concede him the honour of having been the first to comment on the point. Yet Zúñiga cannot deny that I showed even in the first edition that the Greek manuscripts have *Talitha* with a lambda. If Nebrija's *Quinquagenae* were available here, I would have used them more fairly than Zúñiga.

From chapter 8 [on Mark 8:33]

The Greek texts have *ἐπετίμησεν*, and the Translator rendered this by *comminatus est* [he threatened]; I preferred to translate it *increpavit* [he rebuked]. Here Zúñiga's Muse bursts into full bloom. He is 'slaying me with my own sword,' he says, because elsewhere I translated *ἐπετίμησεν* by *interminatus est*, whereas here I reproach the Translator for translating it in a similar manner – as if *interminari* and *comminari* were the same to Latin speakers. *Interminatus sum ne faceres* [I warned you with threats not to do it] is good Latin; I would not venture to say the same of *comminatus sum ne faceres* nor, I think, can the latter expression ever be documented.[191]

From chapter 10 [on Mark 10:63]

Filius Timaei Bartimaeus: [The son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus]: I had indicated that the evangelists translated the meaning of Bartimaeus, that is,

* * * * *

189 See above, pp 12–14, the section 'From the first chapter of Matthew,' but Erasmus forgets that the passage discussed here is in Mark, not Matthew.

190 On Nebrija's *Quinquagenae* see n46 above. He also published a Latin-Spanish/Spanish-Latin lexicon, Salamanca 1492.

191 That is, it cannot be documented in classical authors.

'son of Timaeus.' Here my friend Zúñiga almost dissolves with laughter, not because he denies that Bartimaeus means 'son of Timaeus' but because I said the evangelist had wanted to translate it, and he proves his point with this argument: Son of Timaeus precedes [the name], whereas a translation usually follows it. Who would not envy our blessed Zúñiga his merriment, his laughter, his chuckles? In the meantime this fellow who is so excellently equipped with a knowledge of all things does not realize that his laughter strikes, not me, but Jerome whom I followed. His words in the commentary expounding chapter 4 of the Epistle to the Galatians are as follows:[192] 'Abba,' he says, 'is Hebrew, having the same meaning as "father"; and in many places Scripture preserves the custom of putting the Hebrew term and the translation side by side: Bartimaeus, son of Timaeus; Asder, wealth; Tabitha, gazelle. And in Genesis, Mesech, slave, and other similar terms.' This matter, therefore, I was taught, not by my helper, but by Jerome, with whom Zúñiga does not want me to disagree under any circumstances, while he himself dissolves with laughter and jeers at his comment. And here the marginal summary reads: 'An error of Erasmus concerning the Hebrew language.' And even if I erred, in whatever language, I think that this display of malice on Zúñiga's part is worse than six hundred mistakes in language.

From Luke, chapter 1 [on Luke 1:63]

Et postulans pugillarem [and asking for a writing tablet]: I prefer *postulata tabella* [a writing tablet having been asked for], to preserve both the tense and the number[193] – for the Greek text reads *αἰτήσας πινακίδιον*. I do not condemn the Translator's version. If I am not mistaken, I rendered the meaning of the evangelist in clear and good Latin. What, then, is Zúñiga's complaint? That I varied what was correct? But Augustine[194] has told us that variation is conducive to understanding Scripture. Zúñiga can have his *pugillares* if he does not like *tabellae*. He objects to my quibbling about 'How did he write while asking for a tablet? For he who asks does not yet have at his disposal.' In such cases, he says, the present tense is sometimes put for the past. Perhaps he is right, but it happens quite rarely and it makes for an awkward expression. As for the rest, I am ridiculous in Zúñiga's eyes because I quibble in this manner:

* * * * *

192 Jerome *Comm in Gal* PL 26 400B

193 Unlike the ablative absolute *postulata tabella,* the present participle *postulans* indicates the singular person.

194 Augustine *De doctrina christiana* 2.12.17; but Zúñiga's point was that *pugillaris* was a correct Latin word, so that there was no need to change it to *tabula.*

'If he said it, what need was there to write it down?' And I solve the problem, saying that 'speaking' did not refer to Zechariah, who was still mute, but to the letters which spoke [*scriptura loquens*], for he did not 'speak' with his tongue but with his pen; and soon afterwards, it is added, his tongue was loosened. I ask you, dear reader, do you see anything absurd in these words? Yet Zúñiga thinks that there is no man alive 'grave' enough to read this 'without laughing.' Please note how ridiculously he carries on while making me out as 'ridiculous.' For this acute man writes as follows: 'As if anyone, mute or not, wrote anything other than in silence and spoke the message in his mind rather than uttering words.' I simply do not understand the relevance of his remark. Indeed, nothing prevents anyone from writing and at the same time saying aloud what he is writing down. But what follows is even better. He lectures us *ex cathedra*, as it were: 'One must know,' he says, 'that *dicens* [speaking] cannot refer to a written message which cannot speak; it must refer to Zechariah who expressed through his writing what he had conceived in his mind.' What can be crasser ignorance than this? He tells us what I wrote myself and criticizes what he does not understand. For what else is the meaning of *scriptura loquens* than that a silent writer speaks through his message rather than using his tongue? But even more ridiculous is what he adds: 'to say nothing of the fact that *γραφή*, that is, writing, is feminine in Greek as it is in Latin, whereas *λέγων*, that is, speaking, is masculine which cannot ever agree in Greek with 'writing.' He does not understand that I am speaking, not of the word *γραφή* [writing], but of the act, namely of Zechariah speaking, not with his tongue, but through his writing. Behold, dear reader, what censors, what derisive critics I have. But I am restraining myself. It has not been difficult to guess what annotations Zúñiga made up himself and what he borrowed from the annotations of others. This one he will easily claim as his own authentic offering.

From chapter 2 [on Luke 2:2]

Sub preside Syriae Cyrino [Under Cyrinus, the governor of Syria]: Since the Greek text has *Κυρηνίου*, I translate accordingly and comment on it in one or two words. According to Zúñiga, this is a Roman name used in a corrupt form by the evangelist writing in Greek,[195] like *Ἀκύλας* for *Aquila*, *Πούδης* for *Pudens*, and *Κόϊντος* for *Quintus*. But in these cases there was a reason for the corruption, for example in *κοϊ-* and *ἀκυ-*, because the Greeks do not have the

* * * * *

195 He meant that the Greek *Κυρήνιος* was a corruption for the Roman name Quirinus.

letter q, and ending in *-δης*, because the Greeks do not have words ending in *-ens*. But what need was there for adding a syllable in the case of *Κυρήνιος*?[196] Moreover, if the Latin translator wanted to render the Roman name according to its proper pronunciation, why did he not say 'Quirinus'? Why did Rufinus, the translator of Josephus, not do likewise?[197] Yet I shall not quarrel with anyone about this matter because it is of little significance.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Luke 2:7]

Et pannis eum involvit [and she wrapped him in swaddling clothes]: I do not condemn the Translator's version, but I preferred *et fasciis eum involvit*. The Greek is *ἐσπαργάνωσεν*. Zúñiga admits that *σπαργανώματα* in Greek are those first pieces of clothing in which newborn children are wrapped so that their pliant body is not twisted but turns out straight. What he adds out of Suida[198] – that the proper Greek word for *σπάργανα* is *ῥάκη*, that is, 'rags' – one must not think that *ῥάκη* has no other meaning in Greek except mean and worn-out rags, considering that we read in Matthew[199] *ῥάκος ἄγναφον* where he speaks of the new patch being sewn on to the old, and when Horace[200] says *pannum purpureum* [purple swatch], for a swatch of magnificent cloth having been sewn on to an old and mean one. Furthermore, what he cites out of Ambrose[201] about Christ having been wrapped in rags is no proof obliging us to think that Christ was wrapped in torn and mean rags, but rather that he, who ruled in Heaven, was lowered to the point where he was wrapped in infant's swaddling clothes. 'That he is in *pannis*,' he says, 'you can see – that he is in Heaven, you cannot see.' Even if they had been swaddling him in clothes of purple, they would nevertheless have indicated that God had lowered himself a great deal from his divine majesty.

From chapter 3 [Luke 3:1]

Procurante Pontio Pilato Iudaeam [when Pontius Pilatus was governor of Judaea]: Since the Greek reads *ἡγεμονεύοντος* [governing], I translated *praesidente*, or rather *praeside*. I do not condemn the Translator's version; I say that

* * * * *

196 He is referring to the added 'i.'
197 Josephus *Antiquitates* 17.13.5. The Latin translation was ascribed to Rufinus (c 345–410).
198 A tenth-century Byzantine encyclopedia attributed to an author named Soudas or Souidas, edited by A. Adler (Leipzig 1935). The word is discussed on p 416.
199 Matt 9:16
200 Horace *Ars poetica* 15–16
201 Ambrose *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* CCL 14 49

he took pleasure in varying his expressions, for he now translates by *procurante* what he had a little earlier translated by *praeside*. Zúñiga twists and misrepresents these simple words of mine, implying that I obliquely criticized the Translator for wrongly using *procurante* instead of *praeside* or *praefectum agente* and tells us that the expression *procurare provinciam* is correctly applied to one who is in charge of the official business of a province. What Zúñiga tells us was not unknown to me; the meaning he gives to my words I neither expressed nor ever conceived in my mind. Yet since Zúñiga was concerned to show that *procurare* is used to denote the action of a man who is in charge, he should have produced an example out of the writings of the law experts of old or the approved authors of Latin rather than out of Rufinus' translation of Josephus.[202] Yet I think the man ought to be forgiven for he seems to have no inkling of any Latin author, taking instead more pleasure in Hebrew books.[203] For I have grave doubts that *procurare provinciam* can correctly be said of someone who is *praeses* of a province.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Luke 3:27]

Qui fuit Salathiel [Who was (the son) of Salathiel]: I left out Salathiel (which is what the Vulgate has) and merely commented in my annotation that it was perhaps more correct to say Sealthiel, since this was the Hebrew form. Zúñiga admits that what I say is true, but insists that this word belongs to those that the Greeks adopted and slightly corrupted. Whether that is the case is neither very important nor does it concern me. Nor was there any reason why Zúñiga on account of an insignificant point should rave against 'my helper Oecolampadius' who (and he cites my words) 'is skilled in the three languages.' Zúñiga does not know Oecolampadius except because of my giving him an honourable mention. I suppose he does not hate him simply because he was mentioned by me. I, however, who know both men, value the one Oecolampadius more than ten Zúñigas.

From chapter 7 [on Luke 7:22]

Pauperes evangelizantur [the good news are preached to the poor]: Although I changed nothing in the text and merely noted that *pauperes* here means 'meek' and 'mild' 'according to Hebrew usage, that is צנוי, for Jerome

* * * * *

202 Zúñiga had quoted Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum* 2.15.1 in Rufinus' translation.

203 Another instance of Erasmus insinuating that Zúñiga is of Jewish descent. See n133 above.

rendered it *pauper* [poor],[204] the Septuagint *mansuetus* [meek],[205] because wealth is, generally speaking, accompanied by fierceness'; and in the gospel[206] the poor are called 'blessed' because they are meek and not at all fierce. Zúñiga insists that the Seventy 'were deceived by the similarity' between two letters.[207] Whether this is true I leave others to consider since it does not concern me.

From chapter 10 [on Luke 10:42]

Maria optimam partem elegit [Mary chose the best portion]: Since we read *ἀγαθήν* [good] in Greek, I translated *bonam* instead of *optimam*, yet I add that there is a certain emphasis in the Greek article *τὴν ἀγαθήν*, that is 'that certain portion which is truly good' – thus, far from reproaching the Translator, I justify and approve his version. Zúñiga tells us that the Hebrews lacked a comparative and superlative, and therefore sometimes used the positive instead – and this was the case in this passage, in his opinion. I have no quarrel with Zúñiga in this respect, but I am surprised that the Latin translator acted upon this principle here, when he did not do so in numerous other places. One thing is true: both Augustine and Ambrose read *meliorem* for *optimam*.[208]

From chapter 12 [Luke 12:42]

Ut det illis in tempore tritici mensuram [to give them a portion of wheat at that time]: I show that in Greek *σιτομέτριον* is a compound word so that it does not simply refer to wheat, but also to other food eaten by servants, that is, *demensum cibum* [apportioned food].[209] Here Zúñiga is offended on many counts: because I do not distinguish between *σῖτον* and *σῖτος* and, in explaining that the same words meant [wheat] as well as food, I failed to add

* * * * *

204 As de Jonge notes (ASD IX-2 119), this is true for the majority of the instances, but Jerome also occasionally used other words to translate the Hebrew term, for example, *egenus, inops, egens, indigens*, all meaning 'needy' or 'without means.'

205 But see de Jonge's note with statistics on the various translations of the term in the Septuagint (ASD IX-2 119).

206 Matt 5:3–4, Luke 6:20

207 He means the similarity between the Hebrew letters *iod* and *vau*. The Hebrew words for 'poor' and 'humble' are etymologically related.

208 Augustine *Sermones* 104 PL 38 617; Ambrose *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* CCL 14 242, but only in the paraphrase; in the quotation of the passage he retained *optimam* (best).

209 Erasmus replaced the Vulgate *tritici mensuram* with *demensum cibum* in the second edition.

'when you change the gender.'[210] O grave sin! For I was not concerned with that point nor did it matter as far as the compound word was concerned, which could equally well have been made up of *σῖτον* or *σῖτος*. Then he is offended because I cite Cato's 'books' *On Agriculture*,[211] when there was only one book – as if it were incorrect to say 'in the prophets' even if one cited only what was written in one prophet who was one among many. And there I said 'books' *On Agriculture* because Cato's book is among those that deal with agriculture. Finally, he notes that the passage is not as I cite it. These are such small matters that they are not worth justifying, yet I owed gratitude to the critic for any small point, if only Zúñiga were not so severe a critic that he spoils a welcome service, like the proverbial Scyrian goat.[212]

From chapter 13 [on Luke 13:34]

Hierusalem, Hierusalem, quae occidis [Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill]: I did not change the Vulgate reading but merely indicated in my annotation that the words might be in the third person, 'who casts stones and kills,' because of the pronoun *αὐτήν* which does not seem to fit the second person unless the first syllable is aspirated [*αὑτην*]. Zúñiga contends that *αὐτός* fits any person – this is true when it is emphatic: *αὐτὸς ἔγραψα, αὐτὸς ἔγραψας, αὐτὸς ἔγραψε*. But in other cases I do not think that this rule applies.[213] Moreover, there is no cogent reason why 'Jerusalem' should be a vocative case.[214] And I translated 'those who are sent' only because at the time I used a manuscript that read *ἀποστελλομένους*, whereas when I wrote my *Annotations* I used one that had a different reading.[215] For the task was not accomplished all in one place. Some things I had annotated in Britain, the greater part in Basel, and at different times I used different manuscripts, not just one. Moreover, when it came to Luke, I was so afflicted with ill health that I was forced to give up

* * * * *

210 Erasmus is correct in saying that Greek *σῖτος* does not mean only wheat. It denotes any kind of grain, also foods made of grain, and more generally food. The distinction between *σῖτος* and *σῖτον*, maintained by Byzantine grammarians, has now been refuted.

211 In his 1516 annotation on this passage Erasmus had wrongly used Cato to prove his point. He removed the reference in the third edition (1522).

212 Proverbial for repaying a good with a bad deed (*Adagia* I x 20)

213 Erasmus is right to consider this phrase problematic. His argument shows a better grasp of Greek grammar than Zúñiga's.

214 Erasmus' remark is not cogent. The context requires the vocative.

215 In fact, Erasmus had not changed the Vulgate reading. Zúñiga's criticism was beside the point and there was no need for Erasmus to appeal to the putative reading in Greek manuscripts.

the labour of collating for a few days altogether – yet the presses could not be stopped, [for that would have meant] a great loss to the printer. For this reason I promised another edition,[216] to make good where I had been remiss in the first – and this I have done.

From chapter 16 [on Luke 16:20]

Et erat quidam mendicus nomine Lazarus [and there was a beggar by the name Lazarus]: I noted in passing the meaning of Lazarus in Hebrew, namely 'aided by the Lord.' This is what I learned from the book *Interpres nominum Hebraicorum* [Explaining the Hebrew Names], whether Bede is its author or Remigius.[217] Oecolampadius did not disagree – though I do not see why Zúñiga says in this context that I now invented this helper of mine for the first time.[218] What sort of insult this is, I do not know, for surely he does not think I wanted to cover up my mistakes with an invented name. Yet in rebutting what I had put down, Zúñiga offers nothing but pure guesswork, and that rather vapid stuff. For in his opinion Lazarus comes from Eleazarus, with the first syllable of the word cut short. Neither the book I followed nor Oecolampadius has so little authority with me that I would subscribe to this conjecture.[219] In other respects, though, the matter is hardly of any importance.

From chapter 19 [on Luke 19:4]

Et praecurrens ascendit in arborem sycomorum [And running ahead, he climbed a sycamore tree]: Although I left in the text the wording found in the Vulgate translation, I had noted in one or two words that in this passage the word was *sycomoream* not *sycomorum*. And I explained it as *fatua ficus* [insipid fig], without however concealing my misgivings, since in Greek *sycomorus* and *sycomorea* are spelled with a short 'o,' while Greek *μωρός*, 'insipid,' has a long 'ω'. Of course I was indicating the etymology of the word

* * * * *

216 Ep 417:8

217 This lexicon was often included in editions of the Vulgate (see nn181 and 182 above). Zúñiga in his note on Heb 7:2 suggested that the ninth-century writer Remigius of Auxerre was the author, an attribution modern scholars regard as possible.

218 Zúñiga said no such thing. Erasmus mistakenly connected the words 'invented for the first time' with Oecolampadius' name, whereas Zúñiga refers to the novelty of the name form *Lazariahu*.

219 Contrary to Erasmus' assertion, Zúñiga is correct.

rather than explaining the nature of the tree.[220] For I was not at that point concerned with the tree but only with establishing the correct reading, or else the book would have grown to huge proportions. If the sycamore is not a wild figtree, it certainly shares its name. As for its being called 'insipid,'[221] its juice and fruit, which are called 'dull' and 'diluted' by Dioscorides and Theophrastus,[222] certainly remind one of the wild fig tree. As far as the leaves are concerned, it resembles the mulberry tree[223] which itself is called insipid in Greek and which Dioscorides thinks is the same as the one called by the Greeks *μορέα*. Moreover, that the tree once was infamous for its reputation of folly and sloth is evident from the fact that the Athenians called Sulla by way of insult *συκάμινον ἀλφίτῳ πεπασμένον*, that is, 'sycamore or sycaminum (for this is yet another name for the tree)[224] macerated with bread.'[225] Yet, since it is established that the first syllable in the word for mulberry tree, *morum,* is long in Latin poetry and since it is agreed that it is called sycamore on account of the similarity of its leaves [to that of a fig tree], it appears plausible to me that scribes corrupted the word in Greek so that *sycomorus* was spelled with a short 'o'. This is somewhat more plausible, at least in my opinion, than what Zúñiga proffers: that *morum* had a long first syllable in Latin poetry, just as *ἑλώρια* in Homer, because of the liquid consonant that follows.[226] Nor do I see why Zúñiga believes that the name of the tree must be changed to read *ficomorus*, combining a Greek with a Latin word and, what is more awkward, after the Greek fashion. For we would say *ficimorus* on the analogy of *caprificus*.[227] Oh, what great danger the church would incur, had this not been discussed!

* * * * *

220 Zúñiga rightly questioned this etymological explanation and pointed out that the word is connected with *μόρον,* mulberry.

221 Ie connecting the word with *μωρός* (foolish).

222 Dioscorides *De materia medica* 1.127; Theophrastus *Historia plantarum* 4.4.1

223 Dioscorides says that the leaves are similar.

224 Theophrastus and Dioscorides regarded *συκόμορος* and *συκάμινος* the same tree, but distinguished it from *μορέα*. Erasmus wrongly suggests that all three names refer to the same tree.

225 Plutarch *Sulla* 2. Plutarch, however, is referring to Sulla's blotchy complexion rather than his foolishness.

226 Homer *Iliad* 1.4. Zúñiga correctly stated that a syllable which is by nature short can become long if followed by a liquid.

227 Erasmus is wrong about the Greek/Latin combination. Both *ficus* and *morus* are Latin words. He is correct, however, in stating that the compound requires an 'i' rather than an 'o'.

From chapter 23 [on Luke 23:38]

I encouraged the practice of having the inscription on the cross displayed everywhere in the three tongues, 'in the way John put it' (my words). Here Zúñiga warns the reader not to think that John wrote the trilingual inscription – a good point! For I did not speak of the language but of the meaning which I wanted to have translated into the remaining two languages out of John. As for this quibbling about the Hebrew letters in which the name of Jesus is written,[228] I have no leisure to spend much time on this now, since it does not concern me. I therefore leave this matter to be considered by others who are partial to the Jews.[229]

From the Gospel of John, chapter 1 [on John 1:1]

Et Verbum erat apud Deum [And the word was with God]: In my annotation I write as follows: 'For it is the custom of sacred Scripture most often to attribute the word "God" to the Father – even though it belongs to all persons equally – and I do not know if we ever find the epithet "God" clearly applied to Christ in the writings of the apostles and evangelists, except in two or three places.' Although this remark in the first edition was straightforward and not at all designed to cast doubt on the fact that Christ is God and man – which must be completely beyond doubt for us, even if it were read only once in Holy Writ – but to prompt the studious reader to inquire why the apostles apply the epithet 'God' clearly and continually to the Father, but do not apply it likewise to the Son or the Holy Spirit. When I realized that some people were offended by this remark, or rather, as I think, seized on it as a handle to slander me, I added in the second edition the words: 'although it can be gathered with certainty from many passages that Christ was God and not merely man.'

With this basis established and unshaken I would like to disprove Zúñiga's argument briefly, for he fiercely attacked this passage.[230] First of all, when I said in 'two or three places,' I did not count the places but indicated by a common figure of speech 'a few places.' But even if my memory had been wrong, there was no reason for anyone to fear anything from the

* * * * *

228 Erasmus had used יהושע; Zúñiga suggested the more common form ישוע.

229 Yet another innuendo, suggesting that Zúñiga was of Jewish extraction. See n133 above.

230 Zúñiga attacked Erasmus' statement that Christ was called God in only 'two or three places' and countered by listing ten passages, discussed below. Zúñiga furthermore noted that the church had used several of these passages against the Arians, thus insinuating that Erasmus' position was Arian.

Arians, since I attested in the very passage that the word 'God' applied to all persons equally. Perhaps someone could have suspected that this was done more sparingly by the apostles for fear that at that time profane ears might not be able to tolerate the attribution of the epithet 'God' to a man and as a result might have recoiled from the gospel teaching before they had begun to learn the mysteries of the gospel. In this fashion Christ instructed his apostles to preach penance first and keep silent about Christ.[231] And Peter and Paul, preaching Christ to as yet unenlightened people, called him a man and a human being, saying nothing of 'God.'[232] As for the so-called 'ten passages'[233] Zúñiga casts into my teeth, let me now briefly reply.

Matthew quotes testimony out of Isaiah, chapter 7:[234] 'Behold the virgin will conceive and give birth to a son, and he will be called by the name of Emmanuel, which means God be with you.' Here, in his opinion, 'Christ was manifestly called God,' especially since Jerome[235] interpreted it in this manner when he expounded this prophet. First of all, Christ is not 'manifestly' called God in the words of the prophet; rather, his given name indicates that upon the birth of this child God will be propitious to the human race. For God is said 'to be with' those whom he favours. Indeed the Greeks express themselves in like fashion. When they wish God or the Muses to be favourably disposed toward someone, they wish him 'to be with God' or 'with the Muses.' Nor does Jerome plainly express the meaning Zúñiga forces on his words. Let the prudent reader reread the passage attentively and he will find that it is as I say – for I am aiming at brevity here.

As for the Jews surmising that Christ claimed divinity for himself because he called himself 'Son of God' – this is no argument against me, for it does not follow that everyone who is a 'son of God' is also divine in nature. Christ himself has taught us this for he showed that pious men were called 'sons of God' and even 'gods.'[236] Even if it followed, it would prove nothing

* * * * *

231 Matt 16:20, Mark 8:29–30, Luke 9:20–1

232 Acts 2:22; 17:31; Rom 5:15

233 'So-called' draws attention to the fact that Zúñiga used the form *loca* for 'passages.' The classical form is *loci.*

234 Matt 1:23, citing Isa 7:14

235 Jerome *Comm in Isa* CCL 73 104–5

236 Erasmus is referring to the idiomatic use of 'Son of God,' which is also found in non-Christian texts and applied to charismatic rulers in the sense of 'hero.' For Jesus referring to humans as 'sons of God,' see Matt 5:9 and Luke 20:36; for 'gods,' cf. John 10:35.

against me since I admit that there are many passages in the sacred books which allow the certain conclusion that Christ is God.

As for the passage 'And God was the word,'[237] in which Zúñiga says Christ is openly called God: in my opinion this is a conclusion arrived at by cogent reasoning rather than a plain appellation. For John teaches that the Word of God existed from the beginning, indeed without beginning, before the creation of the world, and that this Word was of divine nature and that the same thereafter was made man. And because he assumed a nature he did not have [that is, human nature] in such a way that he did not cease to be what he was [that is, God], it can be concluded with certainty that he was of a twin nature, divine and human. And I attested to the fact that this can be concluded from many passages in Holy Writ and I would have been impious had I doubted it.

But, [Zúñiga says,] it is even more obvious from the episode in which Thomas touches Christ's side, exclaiming 'My Lord, my God.'[238] Here someone could equivocate, saying that it was an exclamation, not an assertive statement about Christ. But I would rather have this passage included among those in which Christ is 'manifestly' called 'God,' for I do not want to be petty and give offense to the infirm, especially since the dispute is not about Christ but rather about my lapse of memory or lack of knowledge of Scriptures. And there is no danger in letting the adversary have his victory, other than that Erasmus is shown not to have read or not to remember the passages in which Christ is clearly called God.

As for the Acts of the apostles, chapter 20,[239] where Paul says 'Keep watch over yourselves and over the whole flock which the Holy Spirit gave you to guard and rule the church of God which he acquired with his blood,' one may equivocate in two ways: First of all, 'Christ' may be supplied from the sentence that comes a little earlier, 'which I have received from the Lord Jesus' etc – that we might understand the church to be called the church of God the Father, his family, so to speak, which Christ through his blood bound to his father. Secondly, it could be taken to mean that the Father calls the blood of his son 'his' because it was by his will that the Son suffered death for the salvation of the world.

* * * * *

237 John 1:1
238 John 20:28
239 Acts 20:28

As for the passage in the Epistle to the Romans, chapter 9,[240] 'of whom Christ is, according to the flesh, who is above all, God blessed forever,' someone could equivocate, saying that the phrase must be divided thus: 'who is above all' – pause – then as an added exclamation, as it were, 'God, blessed forever' – so that this clause is one of thanksgiving to the Father who put Christ above all.

As for the passage in Philippians, chapter 2,[241] 'though he was in the form of God' etc – I have already explained that it is also expounded by Ambrose in a different sense,[242] not referring to the divine and human natures. Nor is this a case of an epithet proper, nor can it be said to be expressed plainly when orthodox exegetes vary [in their interpretation].[243]

As for Colossians, chapter 2,[244] 'in him the fulness of deity resides in bodily form,' apart from the fact that one may say that this is no epithet in the sense I spoke of – it allows also of another interpretation, namely that the Father gave to Christ in full measure whatever pertains to human happiness, so that one need not seek it either from the philosophers, or from Moses, or from the angels, as if Paul reiterated what he had said a little before: 'in whom every treasure of wisdom and knowledge is hidden.'[245] As for the added *σωματικῶς* [bodily], it is contrasted with the shadows of the Mosaic law rather than related to divine nature.[246]

In addition, the passage in the Epistle to Titus, chapter 2,[247] 'looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour' etc: Apart from the fact that the wording is obviously ambiguous – and this cannot be denied – I have shown that Ambrose[248] interpreted the first part as concerning the Father, not the Son.

* * * * *

240 Rom 9:5
241 Phil 2:6
242 Ie that the passage refers to his superhuman goodness toward the sick (Ambrosiaster CSEL 81.3 141). In his edition of Ambrose (Basel 1527) Erasmus cast doubt on the authenticity of Ambrose's Latin commentary on the Epistles of Paul and therefore called the author 'Ambrosiaster.' In the view of scholars today, the commentary is a patchwork edited and augmented over four hundred years.
243 As Erasmus pointed out in his annotation on Phil 2:6, Hilary and Augustine did interpret the phrase as referring to the divine nature of Christ.
244 Col 2:9
245 Col 2:3
246 For the contrast body/shadow see Col 2:17.
247 Titus 2:13
248 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81.3 330

As for what Zúñiga adduces out of the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 1,[249] 'To the Son, however, he said: Your throne, o God, is forever' – I will not cast doubt on the authority of this epistle[250] nor demand that it be counted in my favour that the wording is obviously ambiguous (as I shall indicate in its place), but this passage is at any rate cited from the Old Testament,[251] whereas I am speaking of the apostolic writings in which they in their own words epitomize Christ. This is an excuse I could have used also with regard to the first passage [cited by Zúñiga], 'God be with us,' which Matthew adduces out of the prophet.[252]

Finally, when he cites from the first Epistle of John, chapter 5,[253] 'And we are in his true son [or: in him, who is real, through his son], Jesus Christ, that is, the true God and eternal life,' to pass over other possible equivocations, there is no cogent reason why we should apply this to the Son. For the meaning could be – indeed, it seems that this was the intended meaning of the writer – that we are not in the devil nor in this vain and deceptive world, but 'in the Father, who is real' and that we are so 'through his son, Jesus Christ,' through whom we are joined with him. And he – the Father – is called the true God and the eternal life, the fountain of all things.

In conclusion: I spoke of the word [God] being 'overtly attributed' [to Christ]; I attested that Christ's divinity could be deduced by reasoning from a number of passages. I meant to say that the Father was called 'God' in so many places whereas the Son was intimated to be, rather than explicitly called, God; by 'overtly' I meant passages about which there was no disagreement among orthodox exegetes and which did not depend on allegories, and in which one could not equivocate; I spoke of the apostolic writings and about two or three, meaning 'a few,' passages – Let Zúñiga go now and enumerate his ten passages proving that I have not read Holy Writ. By my criteria he will hardly find two, I think. Yet I have no intention of waxing eloquent on this matter. I would rather be considered a blockhead or a dolt[254] myself than have the glory of Christ diminished on this occasion.

* * * * *

249 Heb 1:8
250 Erasmus shared the view of many early Christian authors that the Epistle was non-Pauline. See his discussion in the *Apologia against Jacques Lefèvre,* CWE 83 81–6.
251 Ps 44 (45):7
252 See n234 above.
253 1 John 5:20
254 Literally 'stone or mushroom.' For these metaphors see *Adagia* I i 89 and IV i 38.

Ibidem, note 2 [on John 1:46]

A Nazareth potest aliquid boni esse [something good can come out of Nazareth]: Augustine believes that this sentence is congruent with 'come and see' in either the affirmative or interrogative mode.[255] And in the manuscript, which I used at first, no interrogation mark was added. Zúñiga, however, says that 'a question mark' is added 'in all Greek manuscripts, even in the oldest ones.' I admire the man's good luck, if he was able with his keen eyes to see *all* Greek manuscripts. One thing is certain: while the New Testament was being printed in Basel, I had three manuscripts.[256] One was lent to me by the excellent Johann Reuchlin and two were put at my disposal by the monastery of the Dominicans at Basel. One of these contained the Greek commentaries of Theophylact, whom I have cited so many times as 'Vulgarius' because the name 'Theophylact' was barely legible on account of the letters having worn off.[257] This is the same author to whom Zúñiga so often refers as 'Athanasius.'[258] Such a discerning man should have realized and judged by the style that it was not Athanasius, for Athanasius breathes rhetorical force, whereas this author's style is simple and almost weak, crawling on the ground. If in these manuscripts there had been a question mark,[259] I would have pointed out [in my annotation] that either intonation was possible. But this is not so important that I would quarrel with anyone about it.

From chapter 5: [on John 5:2]

Est autem Hierosolymis probatica [Now there is at Jerusalem a sheep market]: Since in the Greek text Bethesda is spelled correctly Zúñiga should have assumed that Bethsesda (with two 's's) in the Latin text was the typesetter's mistake who left in the first 's,' whereas I had crossed it out and written it in where it belongs. By a similar mistake the name happened to be spelled Bethseda in the annotation. If Zúñiga will not grant me this much, I shall refuse to overlook the faulty orthography in his work which is only of modest length. Zúñiga adds that this whole passage, which had been corrupted by

* * * * *

255 The complete verse of John 1:46 runs: 'Nathanael asked: "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" Philip said: "Come and see."'

256 They were AN IV.2, borrowed from Johann Reuchlin (see n280 below), AN IV.1 used as the printer's copy, and AN IV.15, which contained the commentary of Theophylact. All three manuscripts are now in the University Library at Basel.

257 See n122 above.

258 Zúñiga misidentified the eleventh-century Church Father Theophylact as 'Athanasius' (296–373).

259 Erasmus did, however, insert a question mark in the second edition.

scribes, had first been restored by Antonio Nebrija,[260] as if he wanted to prevent me from getting the credit for suggesting that the phrase be emended to read *super piscina* or *ad piscinam*.[261] But I gladly yield this honour – whatever it amounts to – to Antonio, if only the fruit of his labour were made available in our region too.

From chapter 7 [on John 7:38]

Flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae [From within him rivers of living water shall flow]: Here I had added in my annotation: 'This is how John Chrysostom[262] divides the sentence: "As Scripture has it" is to be connected with "believes in me" and what follows "From within him rivers of living water shall flow" are to be the words of Christ, not of Scripture,' etc. There is no reason here for Zúñiga to be indignant except that I had added 'even if Lyra[263] thinks it was added out of Solomon.' Here he is angry with me for two reasons, because I 'deride Lyra everywhere'[264] and because I attribute to Lyra what Jerome wrote first.[265] In this passage at least I do not deride Lyra, nor was there any occasion for Zúñiga to mix in abuse, unless he purposely sought a handle to slander me. And it is plainly false to say that I 'deride' Lyra 'everywhere'; the truth is rather that Zúñiga slanders Erasmus everywhere.

Furthermore, when I say that Lyra said this, I do not mean to deny that anyone else said it earlier. And what Jerome says on this point is rather awkward and contrived. I prefer to subscribe to Chrysostom's interpretation, especially since Augustine too,[266] in explaining this passage, attributes the same words to Christ, making no mention of Scripture.

* * * * *

260 See n46 above.

261 '*Super piscinam* or *ad piscinam*' is a mistake. Erasmus meant to say '*super probatica* or *ad probaticam*.'

262 Chrysostom *Hom in Ioh* 51.1 PG 59 283

263 Nicolaus Lyranus or Nicholas of Lyra (c 1270–1340) wrote a widely used commentary, *Postillae perpetuae in universam Sacram Scripturam.* He considered John 7:38 ('as Scripture says') a reference to Prov 5:16.

264 Erasmus did in fact frequently criticize Lyra, sometimes sarcastically, for example, in his annotation on Matt 6:16, where he speaks of Lyra's 'inept' explanation of the word 'hypocrite' and sneers: 'Let them go now and deny that it matters whether or not a man knows Greek.' Similarly, in his annotation on Luke 1:3 he suggests that Lyra got his information out of 'some gloss, which he could read but couldn't understand because of his ignorance of Greek.'

265 In his annotation on the passage, Erasmus wrote: ' … even if Lyra thinks this was cited from Solomon, following (I believe) the authority of Jerome.'

266 Augustine *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 32.2 CCL 36 301

From chapter 8 [on John 8:3]

Adducunt autem Scribae [The scribes bring]: To show that this story of the woman caught in adultery is not found in all manuscripts, I cite Jerome[267] as a witness and begin with these words: 'Even Jerome in his second dialogue *Against the Pelagians* cites this story, openly admitting that it does not occur in all manuscripts, although he was very much in need of this piece of evidence and in such cases adduces evidence even out of the apocrypha.' And then I quote Jerome's words: 'In the Gospel according to John,' he says, 'we find in many manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, the story of the adulterous woman who is accused before the Lord.' But Zúñiga protests that in my annotation I put 'we do not find.' He must realize that it was not written like this in my manuscript note, but was corrupted during printing by a corrector who was not attentive enough. He thought this was my meaning because I say in the phrase introducing the quotation 'he clearly admits that it is not found in all manuscripts.' I gathered that this was Jerome's meaning, for he writes: 'we find it in many manuscripts, both Greek and Latin,' indicating thereby that it was not found in all of them – yet Jerome authenticates the story by saying that it was found 'in many books.' Nor do I here put the blame on the printers for a mistake I made – I only wish their reliability and diligence were such that I would be completely deprived of such an excuse. But I am obliged to blame them more often than I like. If Zúñiga cannot accept my explanation, let him consider what standards he sets for himself. Indeed, Zúñiga himself should have guessed what I had written rather than demeaning himself by using the odious phrase 'Erasmus misquotes the words of Jerome.'

As for the fact that in my first edition I was under the impression that Augustine had not commented on this story,[268] I corrected myself in the second edition and openly admitted in my apologia against Lee[269] that I was mistaken (as he himself was originally mistaken). For some reason I could not find the passage in the manuscript when I was looking for it, either because I looked for it in a hurry or because the pages were out of order and the comment did not appear in its proper place.

* * * * *

267 Jerome *Dialogus contra Pelagianos* 2.17 PL 23 579A

268 Augustine did so in his *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 33.4–8 CCL 36 307–11.

269 CWE 72 215

Ibidem, note 2 [on John 8:57]

Quinquaginta annos nondum habes [You are not yet fifty years old]: I had indicated that the *Homilies* of Chrysostom[270] have 'forty' instead of 'fifty' years and that the following is added as a comment: 'as if he were already approaching this age.' Zúñiga rejects this comment, reasoning as follows: 'As for him adding the comment "as if he were already approaching this age," it is more likely from these words that Chrysostom read "fifty" than "forty."' What is this? Is a man of about thirty years closer to fifty than to forty? I cannot think that Zúñiga wrote this in earnest. He wanted to test the intelligence of the man he so often calls 'crass,' 'unlearned,' and to top it all, 'a Dutchman.' Yet I suspect that the passage in the Latin Chrysostom is not free of error – and I admit this openly in the second edition.

[In my annotation] I wonder where Hugh of St Cher read what he cites out of Chrysostom,[271] for it does not occur in the texts I have at my disposal. 'He could have read it in manuscripts that Erasmus has not seen,' says Zúñiga. I shall be content if Zúñiga himself offers documentation, for there is nothing he has not seen, nor has he read his authors in snatches, nor is there anything he forgets.

From chapter 12 [on John 12:3]

Maria ergo accepit libram [Mary therefore took a pound]: I surmised that the Greek word *λίτρα* has been derived by the evangelist from the Latin *libra*. Zúñiga shows that, on the contrary, the Latins derived *libra* from [the Greek] *λίτρα*,[272] and he almost succeeds in convincing me, except that, just as some foreign words were brought to Greece together with the things they denoted, for example *πίπερι* [pepper] and *σίνηπι* [mustard], *libra* could have travelled from the Romans to the Greeks – for the origin of the word in Greek remains dark, whereas the Latins have many derivatives from *libra*: *libella* [farthing], *librare* [to balance], *aequilibrium* [balance], *bilibris* [weighing two pounds], etc.

Ibidem, note 2 [on John 12:3]

Nardi pistici [aromatic nard]: In my annotation I had written 'I have spoken about this subject in Luke, for both use the same words,' whereas I should

* * * * *

270 Chrysostom *Hom in Ioh* 55 PG 59 304
271 Hugh of St Cher (1200–63), prominent biblical exegete, in his *Postilla super quattuor evangelia* on John 8:75
272 This etymology is not accepted today.

have said 'I have spoken about this in Mark.'[273] What Zúñiga says is true, but I noticed it first myself and corrected this mistake in the second edition.

From chapter 14 [on John 14:24]

Et sermonem quem audistis non est meus [and the speech you have heard is not mine]: Although he had no reason, Zúñiga nevertheless adds an indignant remark. 'This passage, too,' he says, 'Erasmus would not leave untouched.'[274] And again a little further he says: 'so that he could criticize the Translator in this fashion.' It was Lorenzo[275] who brought accusations against the Translator – I justify him, 'surmising that the passage is corrupt.' Furthermore, to demonstrate that this kind of expression is common, Zúñiga cites some passages out of the poets, whereas it would have been more to the point to cite the orators.[276] But whatever the problem, I consider it of very little importance.

From chapter 18 [on John 18:1]

Trans torrentem Cedron [across the brook Cedron]: I had pointed out that on account of the article added in Greek, *τῶν κέδρων*, it appears that 'Cedron is not a Hebrew word.' Zúñiga tells us that it is a Hebrew word and that the plural article was wrongly added in all Greek manuscripts, for [the singular] *τόν* or *τοῦ* is added in the Septuagint. [277] Yet I find that what Zúñiga says is not consistently the case. 3 Kings, chapter 15, reads as follows in the Aldine edition:[278] *καὶ ἐνέπρησε πυρὶ ἐν τῷ χειμάρρῳ τῶν* [plural] *κέδρων*. In the remaining passages no article is added, nor do we find *κεδρών*, as Zúñiga reports, but rather *κέδρων*.[279] Yet I readily admit that those passages have been corrupted

* * * * *

273 Mark 14:3

274 Erasmus did not change the Vulgate translation, although, as he says in his annotation on the passage, the nominative *sermo* was more appropriate.

275 Erasmus had taken this criticism from Lorenzo Valla's annotation on the passage.

276 Ie prose examples. Zúñiga had cited Virgil *Aeneid* 1.573 and Terence *Andria* 47.

277 If the article is singular, *Κέδρων* is the name of a brook, ie 'the brook Kedron'; if it is plural, the meaning is 'the brook of Cedars,' analogous in formation to 'Mount of Olives.'

278 The first Greek text of the complete Bible, which appeared from the Aldine Press, Venice 1518. The passage is at 3 Kings 15:13.

279 Ie the singular for 'cedar' has the accent on the first syllable; the plural has the accent on the second syllable.

by scribes. And I gladly subscribe to Reuchlin's[280] and Zúñiga's opinion, especially since I suspect that he has taken this from the *Quinquagenae* of Elio Nebrija.[281]

From chapter 19 [on John 19:13]

Et sedit pro tribunali [And he sat down on the judge's bench]: By some misfortune I had come across a faulty Latin manuscript when I worked on the first edition, in which Golgotha was written instead of Gabbata.[282] Assuming that the name was wrong in the majority of manuscripts, I corrected it, noting that Gabbata must be substituted. These are the facts – I admit that I had bad luck in that respect. Zúñiga denies that Golgotha is found anywhere in this passage. Then he has had a great deal more luck than I – if only I would never come across a faulty passage!

Ibidem, note 2 [on John 19:19]

Scripsit autem et titulum Pilatus [and Pilate also added the charge]: I had added in my annotation that the evangelist 'used a Latin loanword, *τίτλον*; the others called it *αἰτία*.' Here Zúñiga has me in a headlock. 'Only Matthew,' he says, 'called it *αἰτία*.'[283] But he fails to recognize the heterosis[284] of numbers, a figure of speech by which one may justify saying 'the thieves spoke ill of Christ,' whereas only one did.

I added that one could also say *ἐπιγραφή*. Here Zúñiga criticizes me, as if I had wanted to create the impression that I was saying something new, when the word *ἐπιγραφή* was found in Mark and Luke.[285] No, I demonstrated that it was unnecessary to use a Latin loanword when a Greek one was at hand. O grave annotations, worthy of a Complutensian theologian!

* * * * *

280 Ie Johann Reuchlin's *De rudimentis Hebraicis* (Pforzheim 1506). Reuchlin (1455–1522) was a prominent Hebraeist. Erasmus made him the hero of one of his colloquies, 'The Apotheosis of that incomparable worthy, Johann Reuchlin' (CWE 39 171–243).

281 See n46 above. Nebrija does not comment on the word *cedron.*

282 John 19:13 reads 'Pilate … sat down in the judgment seat in a place that is called the Pavement, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha.' Zúñiga, perhaps rightly, suggests that Erasmus confused verse 13 with verse 17, which has 'a place called in Hebrew Golgotha.'

283 Matt 27:37

284 This figure of speech, which justifies incongruence in the number between subject and verb, is explained by Quintilian *Institutio oratoria* 9.3.12.

285 Mark 15:26, Luke 23:38

From Acts, chapter 1 [on Acts 1:4]

Et convescens praecepit [And at a meeting he told them]: Since I said a great deal about this matter in the second edition as well as in my reply to Lee,[286] I would rather refer the reader to that place, especially since it cannot be dealt with in a few words. As for Zúñiga's conjecture about the etymology of *συναλιζόμενος*[287]– that the word is derived from salt – I likewise added that to the third edition and I would be very pleased if he had cited an authority for it.

As for the rest, what I adduced with regard to *convescens* being a corruption of *conversans*, I took from Valla's notes.[288]

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 1:12]

Tunc reversi sunt Hierosolymam [Then they returned to Jerusalem]: Here Zúñiga brings serious reproaches against me because, relying on the commentaries of Lyra and the *Ordinary Gloss*, I thought that a sabbatical journey could be no longer than one mile.[289] Does this not prove at any rate that I do not deride Lyra everywhere when I attribute so much importance to him here? As for the *Ordinary Gloss* – everyone knows how great its authority is among theologians.[290] It would therefore be fairer if Zúñiga quarreled with those authorities than with me, especially since I was working at great haste and did not have at my disposal the *Quinquagena* of Nebrija[291] to enrich my annotations. Although Zúñiga adduces some things here that are worth knowing, he also assumes others that I would want to see documented by him. For he assumes – without offering proof – that one *leuca* encompasses four miles.[292]

* * * * *

286 CWE 72 245–8

287 The etymology of the word *συναλίζομαι* [to share] remains unclear.

288 That is, Erasmus had rendered the Greek word, meaning 'meeting,' as *conversans* (talking together) because he assumed that *convescens* (eating together), the word found in the Vulgate, was a corruption for *conversans*.

289 Erasmus had borrowed this explanation without attribution from the commentary of Lyra or the *Ordinary Gloss* on this passage. He was critical of Lyra (see n264 above) and normally shied away from using the *Ordinary Gloss*. See n76 above and the comment in his apologia to Carranza (see p 185 below): 'it has no order … It is a concoction and a cento carelessly patched together from fragments of diverse authors with no titles added.'

290 See n264 above.

291 On Nebrija, see n46 above.

292 See the entry in Lewis-Short on *leuca*: 'a Gallic mile of 1500 Roman paces, a league.'

Ibidem, note 3 [on Acts 1:14]

Hii omnes perseverabant [All of these continued]: Since the text has *σὺν γυναιξί* and the Translator rendered it *mulieribus* [with their women], I indicated that it could also be translated *cum uxoribus* [with their wives], for he added separately 'and the mother of Jesus' and *γυνή* is ambiguous in Greek, applying to any woman or to a wife.[293] Zúñiga prefers to apply the term to 'the women who first followed the Lord for the sake of his teaching and afterwards did not leave the assembly of the apostles.' The translation preferred by Zúñiga is the one I adopted as well. Furthermore, the fact that Jerome, in writing against Jovinianus,[294] thinks that the other apostles had no wives because it is clearly reported of Peter that he had a wife whereas nothing was said about the rest – it amounts to nothing more than an argument from probability and would carry more weight if he had not written it combatting Jovinianus, the zealous advocate of marriage. Clement in Eusebius' *History of the Church*, book 3,[295] certainly did not hesitate to attribute wives to Philip and Paul, mentioning this in two passages in his letters.

Ibidem, note 4 [on Acts 1:19]

Ita ut appellaretur ager ille Acheldemach [So that that field was called Acheldemach]: I had indicated that the Greek manuscripts read *Ἀκελδεμά*, which 'comes closer to the Hebrew word.' Up to this point Zúñiga has no quarrel with me; indeed, he himself teaches what I have pointed out. But he objects to my calling it a 'Hebrew word,' whereas it is Chaldaic.[296] If Jerome does not do the same somewhere,[297] I shall not object to having this imputed to me as a great crime – for the two languages are closely related. Furthermore, what is so novel about calling the language commonly used by the Hebrews 'the Hebrew language'? For Luke in Acts 1 shows that the inhabitants of Jerusalem spoke thus when he writes 'and it was made known to all inhabitants of Jerusalem that the field would be called in their language Acheldemach.'[298] As for the rest – in what Hebrew characters the name

* * * * *

293 Erasmus repeatedly used this tradition to promote the idea of allowing priests to marry, as, for example, in *On eating meat*, CWE 72 73–5.
294 Jerome *Ad Jovinianum* 1.26 PL 23 257
295 Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.30.1
296 That is, Aramaic, or as it is called now, Syriac
297 For example, *Ep* 57.7.1. Interchanging the terms was common in authors of the early church.
298 Acts 1:19

Akeldema is written – I leave the defense to my helper, of whom Zúñiga rather impudently writes that he is as 'unskilled' in Hebrew as I.

From chapter 4 [on Acts 4:27]

Convenerunt enim vere in civitate [Indeed, they gathered in this very city]: Since the Greek here is *παῖδα*, I preferred to translate *filium* [son] rather than *puerum* [boy, servant], basing this on the opinion of Valla.[299] I know that Jerome contends in many places that the term *servus* [servant] is fitting to denote Christ.[300] Yet the author of the commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which are attributed to Chrysostom,[301] does not tolerate having this epithet attributed to Christ. And Ambrose[302] does not approve of those who ascribe to Christ 'the status of servant' because he assumed human nature, but rather because he was executed and nailed to the cross like a wicked servant. But I take no part in this discussion. I denied that the epithet servant was suitable for describing Christ in the sense that it was not suitable for describing the apostles: 'Now I shall no longer call you servants but friends.'[303] Christ obeyed, not as a servant, but as a son, for he obeyed voluntarily, out of love, not fear. Nor do I see why we should recoil from calling Christ 'servant' according to his nature,[304] for he was a man; nor again why we are arguing too fiercely about an epithet that can be neither ascertained nor rejected on the basis of Holy Writ, since *παῖς* is an ambiguous word in Greek as is the corresponding Hebrew word, they say.[305]

* * * * *

299 The reference is to the phrase 'against your holy child Jesus' at Acts 4:27. For the discussion of the meaning of Greek *παῖς* and Latin *puer,* which can mean either boy/child or servant, see also p 7 above.

300 Zúñiga had quoted five passages from various works of Jerome to prove this point.

301 Chrysostom *Hom in Heb* 3 PG 62 142–3. Erasmus was not convinced of the authenticity of this work, thus his remark 'attributed to Chrysostom.'

302 Ambrose *Ep* 1.46 PL 16 1194–9. But Erasmus does not acknowledge that Ambrose there connects the word both to Christ's humiliation and passion and to his birth and incarnation.

303 John 15:15

304 This may seem to contradict the preceding sentence, but Erasmus was merely concerned about the word 'servant,' suggesting that Christ obeyed God under compulsion rather than voluntarily. He did not object in principle to designating Christ as God's servant.

305 The Hebrew term *ebed*, however, means 'slave, servant, minister,' not 'son.'

But since I have already long ago replied to Lee regarding this matter,[306] I do not think it worthwhile to repeat here what I have written; I shall merely touch on what Zúñiga mentions specifically, for whereas before he played strictly the grammarian, he now threatens some theological argument and challenges me as a theologian (for he says that I boast this title).[307] He warns me of the risk of a twofold heresy in denying that Christ was a servant: one is the heresy of the Apollinarians, the other that of the Arians.[308] As if anyone who denied that Christ is called 'servant' in Scripture took away his human nature, and anyone who said that Christ obeyed the Father as a son to the very cross, sided with the Arians, who deny that the Son is equal to the Father.

To reveal to everyone the petulant and no less ignorant malice of this fellow Zúñiga, I shall quote his own words. For when he had cited the gist of Ambrose's argument in Epistle 47, he added: 'Since this is so, let Erasmus who calls himself a theologian take care lest by saying that the epithet "servant" does not suit Christ he fall into the heresy of the Apollinarians. As for what he adds immediately afterwards, that Christ, though obeying and being subject to the Father according to his assumed human nature, obeyed the Father as a son, not as a servant: one ought to consider whether this does not smack of Arius. For since the Son is equal to the Father, and obedience and subjection designate inferiority, it is obvious that Christ obeyed and was subject, not as a son but as a servant, that is, according to his assumed human nature.'[309]

After spewing out such stupid stuff, he adds a neat conclusion: 'But this (he says) and numerous other things of the same kind in Erasmus' *Annotations*, which have an air of impiety about them (unless one ought rather to ascribe it to ignorance), I shall reserve for a second work.'[310] Thus far Zúñiga who,

* * * * *

306 CWE 72 249–50

307 Erasmus quotes Zúñiga in full in the next paragraph. He himself was ambivalent about claiming to act in any capacity other than that of a 'grammarian.' See his prolegomena to the New Testament, CWE 41 839 and Ep 373 91–118.

308 On Arianism, see n23 above. The fourth-century sect of Apollinarianism believed that Christ had a human body but a divine mind instead of a human soul, ie that he was not fully human.

309 Erasmus quotes Zúñiga's note ad locum accurately, except for leaving out *etiam* (also) in the phrase 'one ought to consider' and *patri* (the Father) after 'obeyed and was subject.'

310 That is, for his *Erasmi Roterodami Blasphemiae et impietates*, a manuscript he submitted to Pope Leo X in 1521. Since he was unable to obtain permission for publication from the pope, he published an abridged version after Leo's death, in 1522. For Erasmus' reply see pp 241–85 below.

as long as he keeps within the boundaries of Nebrija's annotations,[311] offers in one way or another something worth reading, but beyond that he is out of his depth and begins to give the impression of being the tool of some slanderous pseudo-monk and goes utterly mad – for I cannot think of any other explanation but that he has been suborned to act out this drama as a hired player.

First of all, I never argue that Christ, who makes himself the servant of all, cannot be called 'servant of God.' 'The Son of Man,' he says,[312] 'has not come to be served, but to serve.' But, Zúñiga says, Christ is called 'servant' by the same token that he is called man. Even this I have no great desire to refute here, although Ambrose tells us differently in his commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, chapter 2.[313] His words are as follows: 'Yet he is not said to have accepted the form of God, but to be "in the form of God," whereas he is said to have accepted the form of a servant, being humiliated like a sinner. For men become servants through sin. Thus Ham, the son of Noah, was the first to be rightly called "servant."' You see, dear reader, that Ambrose did not attribute to Christ the epithet 'servant' because he had assumed human nature, but because he suffered the indignities of a human nature subject to sins. And lest you think this is a figment of my imagination, listen to what follows next: 'For I am not of the opinion which some hold,' Ambrose says, 'that he accepted the form of servant in the act of being born a man.' And in the same place this follows immediately afterwards: 'Observe what he says: "Let this mind be also in you that was in Jesus Christ," that is, of God and man. Before his incarnation he could be called either Christ or Jesus because both names equally denote him as the Son of Man and the Son of God. Before the nativity what does he say, among other things? "For the rock was Christ" and "Let us not test Christ as some did." Thus wherever Scripture wished to denote either God or man, they put either of the two names – Jesus or Christ.' Thus Ambrose.

What is the purport of his words, if not that when we denote either nature in Christ, we say either Jesus or Christ; when we wish to denote the indignities he suffered, we call him servant? Before he assumed human nature, he could not be called a servant; after he had put away mortality, he could no longer be called a servant. This appears to be the meaning of the

* * * * *

311 See n46 above.
312 The quotation is from Matt 20:28.
313 Ambrosiaster on Phil 2:7–8 CSEL 81 140

writer, whoever he was. For my impression is that this text is a patchwork sewn together from the commentaries of Ambrose, like the *Ordinary Gloss* we now have.[314]

But [Zúñiga objects]: In a letter Ambrose accuses of heresy anyone who denies that Christ can be called 'servant.' First of all, let the slanderer decide which he wants to carry more weight, the sacred commentary or a letter sent to a friend.[315] Yet if one takes a closer look, Ambrose's meaning in the letter is the same as his teaching in the commentaries: The heretic[316] denied that Christ had truly suffered. He could not have truly suffered unless he was human. In so far as he suffered, he is said to be a servant; according to his human nature he suffered. Thus it comes about that he who does not admit that he truly suffered denies that he was truly man. But it does not follow immediately that he was called a servant simply in so far as he was man; for he could be human yet immune to afflictions and punishments. Indeed, in the same letter, Ambrose advocates the view that Christ was called servant in the same fashion that he was called 'sin,' 'malediction,' and 'reproach.'[317] These terms did not suitably denote him, unless he was man, yet they did not denote him in so far as he was man; for he could be man without being sin. And this is the magnificent explanation by which my excellent critic, Zúñiga, makes me out as Apollinarian.

Now observe the arguments by which Zúñiga makes me an Arian. Erasmus says:[318] 'He obeyed and was subjected, not as a servant but as a son. But the Son is equal to the Father, therefore [one might say] the Son was not subject to the Father.' O mind duller than any pestle, as Jerome puts it![319] In so many passages Paul and John[320] call those reborn in Christ 'sons of God,' and Christ, insofar as he was man, shall not be called 'Son of God'? Especially, since in the gospel[321] Christ himself answers this calumny. The

* * * * *

314 For Erasmus' doubts about Ambrose's authorship, see n242 above. On the *Ordinary Gloss*, see n76 above.

315 The passage in Ambrose cited by Zúñiga is from his letters, *Ep* 1.46 PL 16 1194–9. Zúñiga said that Ambrose 'taught that Christ the Lord could be called correctly and piously "the servant of God," in so far as he was human' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge, ASD IX-2 145).

316 Ie an adherent of Apollinarianism who denied that Christ was fully human. See n308 above.

317 Eg 2 Cor 5:21, Gal 3:13, Ps 68 (69):20

318 A paraphrase of Erasmus' annotation

319 The expression 'duller than a pestle' is used by Jerome *Ep* 69.4 CSEL 54 686.

320 For example, Rom 5:2, John 1:12

321 Matt 26:63, Mark 14:62, Luke 22:70, John 10:31–8

Son of God is 'equal to the Father'[322] and the Son of God is lower than the Father because Christ is called Son of God 'in two senses, by nature and by grace. Yet, in whatever sense you interpret 'Son of God,' the statement 'The Son of God was subject to the Father'[323] is no less heretical than the statement 'The Son of God died and was buried.'[324] Nor is it always true – as Zúñiga assumes – that whoever is said to have obeyed or be subjected to someone is of a lower rank. Jesus was obedient and subject to Mary and Joseph, yet greater than either. And if his obedience to them was piety, one must even more readily attribute it to piety that he obeyed his heavenly father.

I shall not adduce here the argument that orthodox writers do not hesitate to say that the Son must be subjected to the Father even according to his divine nature, but in such a manner that the subjection does not make the Son inferior to the Father, and only to proclaim the authority of the Father. And what is absurd about saying that the Son obeyed the Father even according to his divine nature? If we believe Hilary,[325] 'let there be light' are the words of the Father telling his Son what he wishes to be done; the Son created everything at the command of the Father. The Father created the Son – that cannot be denied – but did he create him obedient or disobedient? According to the same exegete he was sent into the region of the Sodomites. No doubt he was not yet born a man when he was sent and in executing the commands of the sender, obeyed and followed the command. Zúñiga concludes that, since whoever gives commands is superior and whoever obeys inferior, the Son is inferior to the Father. Hilary at any rate admits that the Father is superior to the Son in this sense: that he has his own authority. But these are, in my opinion, peripheral matters, and I adduce them only to show more clearly the impudence of the slanderer who raises a tragic fuss because I said – thinking of the human nature – that Christ obeyed the Father, but as a son, whereas the orthodox writers of old did not scruple to say that he had obeyed the Father as a son according to his divine nature and like an emissary of him who sent him.

To make an end of it: if he is called 'servant' who carries out his duty for fear of ill treatment and out of the necessity of his condition, it would be absurd to call Christ 'servant,' nor are we, whenever 'inspired by the spirit of

* * * * *

322 Zúñiga's position (for his exact words, see n315 above)
323 Erasmus' position
324 The wording of the Apostles' Creed
325 Loosely referring to *De trinitate* 4.16–17 and 28–9 CCL 62 117–21 and 132–3

filial love we cry Abba, Father,'[326] seeking what is beyond the bounds of piety. If, however, one is called a servant who is a loyal follower and who diligently carries out another's wishes, nothing prevents us from calling Christ 'servant of God' according to his human nature, but in such a manner that nothing prevents us from calling him also 'Son of God' according to the same nature, for he suffered, not out of fear, but willingly, motivated by love.

This is Zúñiga's impudent calumny, and he promises another book of similar annotations.[327] But I would rather be guilty of some unorthodox opinion through a simple error in understanding – which happened, as we know, to Jerome, Cyprian, and other well-respected orthodox writers[328] – than to labour under the illness that seems to afflict the author of this slander. For there are two possibilities: either he himself is an impudent sycophant, or he hired out his services to people of this sort. I take away Christ's human nature? – I, who worship it in so many books? I make Christ inferior to the Father according to his divine nature? – I who so many times denounce the Arians? I have defended myself against the charge of heresy; let Zúñiga defend himself against the suspicion of wrongful and malicious slander. Let him call me 'a Dutch fool,' let him call me 'boorish, crass, feeble-minded, ignorant,' a blockhead, a lump of lead, a tree-trunk – that does not greatly affect me; but who can bear to be suspected of a double heresy on the basis of reasoning only a shameless buffoon would use, and of a heresy that does injury, not to the Pope or the pronouncements of the scholastics, but to Christ himself? No doubt, however, Zúñiga thinks he is being absolutely charming and witty here.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 2:46]

Joseph autem, qui cognominatus est Barnabas [Joseph, however, who is called Barnabas]: Here I shall once again claim the right to use the word 'Hebrew' in a somewhat broader sense;[329] even if Jerome somewhere[330]

* * * * *

326 Rom 8:15

327 See n310 above.

328 Erasmus thought that Jerome's views on remarriage were not entirely orthodox (Ep 1334:509–13); for his views on Jerome and Cyprian's unorthodox views see also p 132 below; on Cyprian and Hilary see Ep 1000:124–52. For similar remarks on Tertullian and Augustine, see Ep 1334:506–9, 516–19.

329 In his annotation on the passage, Erasmus wrote 'For Barnabas is a Hebrew word.'

330 Jerome *Prologus Tobiae*, the prologue preceding the book of Tobias in the Vulgate, says 'Chaldaic is close to the Hebrew language.'

distinguishes Hebrew from Chaldaic, I shall refer to it as 'Hebrew' since it is a language that is very close to Hebrew and related to it, and one which Zúñiga himself admits was commonly used by the Hebrews. I noted that Barnabas in Hebrew means 'son of consolation,' and this is how Luke himself interprets it in this passage. All manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, agree on this word, including even that wonderful Rhodian manuscript, I believe, which is blessed, if for no other reason than being cited so often by Zúñiga.[331] This is the interpretation of the author of the *Liber Hebraicorum nominum* [Book of Hebrew Names][332] and this is how Jerome, too,[333] interprets it in the tract in which he expounds the Hebrew terms collected out of Acts: 'Barnabas,' he says, '"son of the prophet," or "son of the coming," or, as the majority think, "son of consolation."' Zúñiga denies that Barnabas means anything like the explanation given by Luke, and conjectures that all Greek manuscripts are corrupt, and that Luke originally wrote 'Barnahum.' Let others judge whether Zúñiga's guess is correct; he ought not to accuse me of an error, when I followed the authority of Luke and Jerome.

From chapter 7 [on Acts 7:43]

Et transferam vos trans Babylonem [And I shall exile you beyond Babylon]: This is what some Latin manuscripts have; by contrast there are others that have *in Babylonem* [to Babylon].[334] In Greek, however, the words are *ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος*, that is, 'beyond Babylon.' Yet Amos, chapter 5,[335] from which this passage is taken, reads somewhat differently: *μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Δαμασκοῦ*, that is, 'I shall exile you beyond Damascus.' Jerome[336] excuses Luke or Stephen, saying that he renders the sense rather than the words of the prophet, that is, 'I shall exile you beyond Damascus to Babylon or beyond Babylon.' Zúñiga prefers to assume that this passage as well is corrupted in all Greek and Latin manuscripts, and that one should read *ἐπέκεινα Δαμασκοῦ* instead of *ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος*. He says this [kind of error] is nothing new in Holy Writ. In the same manner Isaiah was put for Aseph in Matthew,

* * * * *

331 Zúñiga cited the (unidentified) manuscript five times, in notes on 1 Cor 2:3, James 1:22, 2 Pet 2:2, 1 John 3:16, 1 John 5:20.

332 Ie the list of Hebrew names with explanations, which often appeared in Vulgate editions

333 Jerome *Liber Hebraicorum nominum* PL 23 883/4

334 Erasmus had opted for the translation *in Babyloniam.* Although he defends his translation here, he changed it in later editions to *ultra Babylonem.*

335 Amos 5:27

336 Jerome *Comm in Amos* 2 CCL 76 297. The passage had been quoted by Zúñiga.

and in the same evangelist Jeremiah for Zechariah.[337] But he has nothing to criticize here, except that I did not annotate this passage, whereas elsewhere [he says] I was excessively inquisitive. But in such a mass of material some things are bound to escape the eye.

From chapter 8 [on Acts 8:32]

Tanquam ovis ad occisionem ductus est [He was led like a lamb to the slaughter]: Here Zúñiga accuses me of manifest 'hallucination' because in my book I cited chapter 50 of Isaiah, whereas the passage is in chapter 53. As if printers did not make mistakes everywhere in numerical notations, nor are these mistakes easily detected by the proofreader if he does not check it against the original. Anyone will recognize the truth of this when he sees that the [correct] number was restored in the second edition. As for the question whether the Ethiopian read out of a Hebrew or a Greek volume,[338] I shall not waste words on it since it is not important.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 8:40]

Inventus est in Azoto [He was found at Azotus]: Commenting on the correct use of the Latin words *inventus est*, I had added: 'Who was looking for him so that he was "found" there?' I at any rate prefer *repertus est*, for in Latin *repertus* is used of someone who is encountered somewhere suddenly or unexpectedly.[339] Zúñiga says it would have been ridiculous of the Translator to want to observe these niceties of the Latin language. That is certainly a surprising statement. But even if it had been ridiculous of the Translator, it was not absurd of me to make a note of it, since I had undertaken the task of cleansing the language of the New Testament of solecisms, as far as possible. Zúñiga, meanwhile, seems to have forgotten what he said in his preface – that

* * * * *

337 Matt 13:35, according to the reading of some manuscripts, and 27:9 where a quotation from Zechariah is ascribed to Jeremiah

338 Erasmus suggested that the Ethiopian had read the Greek version, whereas Zúñiga suggested that it was more likely that he knew more Hebrew than Greek and therefore read the former version. There are no significant differences in the two versions of Isa 53:7–8.

339 The difference between *invenire* (to find what one has been looking for) and *reperire* (to find unexpectedly) is also explained in Erasmus' *Paraphrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae* (ASD I-4 310).

the Translator had given an elegant and correct Latin version[340] – and that he had professed to be the defence counsel in this case. How did he translate elegantly, if he found it embarrassing to observe niceties?

Furthermore, when I add the Hebrew word[341] corresponding to 'Azoto,' which Zúñiga thinks is a corrupt form, he expresses surprise at my impudence for not having consulted my friend Oecolampadius here, although I was aware of my inexperience. Zúñiga will be glad to know that this word was actually added on the prompting of Oecolampadius. Therefore Zúñiga ought to take the matter up with him, not me.

From chapter 10 [on Acts 10:38]

Quomodo unxit eum Deus [how God anointed him]: I had indicated two variants, *ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτόν*, that is, *quomodo unxit eum* [how he anointed him] and *ὃν ἔχρισεν αὐτόν*, that is, *quem unxit eum* [whom he anointed], noting that in the latter variant the Latin translator should have omitted the pronoun *eum*, which is added in conformity with Hebrew idiom. Here Zúñiga quibbles about something or other: since the Translator was translating from a manuscript which had *ὡς ἔχρισεν*, the pronoun need not be omitted. But this is precisely the point of my note.

As for the rest, it matters very little whether Peter spoke these words in Hebrew or Greek, except that it pleases Zúñiga to think that he spoke Greek, for no other reason, I think, than that he suspected this alternative would be less acceptable to me. Yet Peter could have spoken Hebrew to Greeks and been understood nevertheless.[342]

From chapter 12 [on Acts 12:8]

Praecingere et calcia te caligas [Put on your belt and your shoes]: I had translated *καὶ ὑπόδησον τὰ σανδάλιά σοῦ* by *subliga soleas tuas* [tie on your sandals] because in ancient times they used sandals for shoes. They were tied with strings to keep them attached to the feet. Here Zúñiga attempts to alter the Greek reading for some reason or other and to read *ὑπόδυσον* [put on] for *ὑπόδησον*, since [he says] 'both words are of the same sound in Greek'

* * * * *

340 In the preface to his book, Zúñiga had claimed that the Vulgate translation was proper and 'elegant' Latin. Erasmus and other humanists used 'elegant' in the sense of correct (that is, classical) usage.

341 Erasmus had mistakenly cited the word in a form that contained a suffix indicating direction.

342 He means that Greeks in Caesarea likely understood Hebrew.

(for this is how Zúñiga permits himself to speak).[343] But here he teaches us an entirely new thing, namely that shoes are 'put on,' and to convince us he adduces the author Suetonius.[344] And yet, being a civil man, he allowed the old reading *ὑπόδησον* to remain. But what need was there for this conjecture, when *ὑπόδησον* fits the context perfectly, is a very common word in Greek, and when there is complete agreement in the manuscripts?

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 12:13]

Pulsante autem eo ad ostium ianuae [He kept knocking on the door, however]: Zúñiga does not deny that Greek *πυλών* can mean either *ostium* [door] and *vestibulum* [entrance way]. I therefore translated *vestibulum*.[345] The phrase would not make sense unless you take *θύρα* to be that which precludes access and *πυλών* the opening in the wall which allows access. Here Zúñiga presents a longwinded argument that my translation does not make sense, that '*vestibulum* does not form part of the building but is an open space in front of a building.'[346] It does make sense, if one thinks of *vestibulum* as a roofless space separated from the road by a wall – this type of *ostium* is certainly shut at night to make the house safer.

Ibidem, note 3 [on Acts 12:22]

Populus autem acclamabat [The people shouted approval, however]: I do not understand at all what Zúñiga has in mind here since the Greek manuscripts are in total agreement, reading *φωνὴ θεοῦ*, that is, the voice of God,[347] and the meaning fits neatly. For Herod was holding forth and the flatterers applauded him, as if the voice of God rather than that of a man had spoken – and indeed Aeneas in Virgil[348] also recognizes Venus by her voice. Zúñiga twists the passage and corrupts it, postulating the reading *φωνῇ θεοῦ*, that is, 'with the voice of God,' as if the voice of the people had been the voice of

* * * * *

343 There is no manuscript evidence for Zúñiga's conjecture, and the form is questionable.

344 Erasmus is being ironical since there is no need to give a cross reference to Suetonius (*Augustus* 92) for a meaning that is common and well known.

345 Erasmus had translated Greek *τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος* by *ostium vestibuli.*

346 A passage quoted from Gellius 16.5.3

347 The verse runs: 'And the people gave a shout, saying, it is the voice of a god, and not of a man.' Zúñiga preferred to read the Greek *φωνῇ* with a subscript jota, that is, as a dative which yielded the meaning: 'And the people gave a shout with such a voice as that which is addressed to a god, not a man.'

348 Virgil *Aeneid* 1.328

God. And here he talks nonsense most shamelessly and at great length, chasing after nothing but an opportunity to relate a story out of Eusebius and Josephus.[349] It would have been more apposite if he had not criticized me undeservedly or on his own authority changed the reading which agrees in all Greek manuscripts.

From chapter 13 [on Acts 13:13]

Et cum a Papho navigasset Paulus [And when Paul had sailed from Paphus]: Since the text says *οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον*, I translated 'those who were with Paul,' creating the impression that I did not recognize the Greek figure – a point on which I had earlier on criticized Valla.[350] But that figure is not always applicable, and if one says that 'those who were with Paul, set sail,' one does not necessarily exclude Paul from the voyage, as Zúñiga quibbles. Yet I corrected the passage, even though the Translator expands on what Luke said,[351] if we accept the figure – a point Zúñiga frequently criticizes in me.

From chapter 14 [on Acts 14:1]

Factum est autem in Iconio [it was done in Iconium]: I had indicated that it was better Latin to say *factum est Iconii*, since it is the name of a city. Again Zúñiga is indignant about the 'wretched grammarians' observations,'[352] yet he himself cites the grammarian Priscian[353] to show that it had been correct to add the preposition. I knew that these forms of speech are sometimes found in authors, but I gave preference to what was more common and farther removed from poetic diction.

* * * * *

349 Zúñiga relied on Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.10 and Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* 19.8.2, but as Erasmus says, there is no manuscript evidence for the passage in Scripture to support this reading and interpretation.

350 In his annotation on John 11:19, Erasmus had criticized Valla for not recognizing the idiomatic use of *περὶ τὸν Παῦλον,* which literally means 'around' or 'with' Paul, but in fact includes Paul and thus should properly be translated 'and Paul.' Here, as Zúñiga gleefully noted, Erasmus made the same mistake he had criticized in Valla.

351 The Vulgate read 'Paul *and* those who were with him.'

352 In his note on the passage, Zúñiga wrote that the Translator was more concerned 'with giving a bona fide rendition of the Greek words than with the overly finicky observations of the grammarians.'

353 Priscian, *Institutiones grammaticae* 18.217; nevertheless Erasmus is correct when he says that in classical Latin the locative rather than a preposition was used to indicate in what city an event took place.

As for the rest, Zúñiga is right to note that Iconium in this passage is a community in Lycaonia, not Cilicia – this mistake was the result of a scrambling of words. For it should have read: 'There are two cities of this name, one in Cilicia, the other in Lycaonia – the one that concerns us here.' But I had corrected this error (either the typesetter's or the copyist's, if I am not mistaken) in the second edition.

From chapter 15 [on Acts 15:13–14]

Viri fratres audite me [Men and brothers, hear me]: I had cited the opinion of Valla who suspects that 'Simeon' is a Greek word, a slight variation on the Hebrew 'Simon.'[354] Here Zúñiga, first of all, accuses me of plagiarism, saying that I filched most of my stuff from the annotations of Lorenzo Valla. What could be more impudent than this, when I so often disagree with Lorenzo, when I proffer so much that he does not touch upon and omit so much that he pursues at great length, and when I cite his name so many times? But then he shifts the responsibility from me to Lorenzo: let him therefore answer for himself, for I do not care which word is Greek, which Hebrew. I know that Simon is the name of a person in Greek, as attested by the [Greek] adage[355] 'I know Simon, and Simon knows me.'

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 15:40]

Paulus vero electo Syla [Paul, after Syla was elected]: To express more precisely the Greek word, which is *ἐπιλεξάμενος*, I had translated *allecto Syla*, from *allegere*, as in the phrase *allegi in senatum*, referring to someone being coopted into the senate. Zúñiga rejects the word, not because it is incorrect, but because it is ambiguous: someone might think it is derived from *allicio*, not from *allego*. But it was the correctness of the word that prompted me to disregard the inconvenience of it being ambiguous, an inconvenience scholars often disregard without specific reason; nor are *allego* and *eligo* necessarily the same, as Zúñiga believes. I 'choose' [*eligo*] a tutor for my friend's children; I do not 'coopt' him [*allego*].

From chapter 16 [on Acts 16:11]

Et sequenti die Neapolim [and the following day to Naples]: Here I had noted that 'this is not the Naples in Italy which is now occupied by the

* * * * *

354 In fact, Valla said: 'In Greek [manuscripts] it is not Simon, but Symeon.'
355 *Adagia* II v 49

Spaniards,[356] but another one in Caria, Asia Minor.' Here Zúñiga brings against me the accusation of blasphemy and *lèse majesté* on account of one little word, 'occupy,' which he interprets 'that is, holding it without just title, like tyrants.'[357] And this is how he prefaces the accusation which he is about to make: 'Does he not deserve a whole wagonful of insults, as they say,[358] this Dutchman (for I don't want to go as far as calling him a Sarmatian)?'[359] Who can refrain from laughing at Zúñiga's fine words, when he thinks that it is a tremendous insult to be called 'a Dutchman'? Moreover, who believes that there is any relationship between Dutchmen and Sarmatians? But to reply to his accusation: Does everyone who 'occupies' a city 'occupy it as a tyrant and without just title'? Pray does he who occupies a vacant spot, 'occupy it as a tyrant'? Does a tree that 'occupies' a place so that it leaves no room for another 'occupy it unjustly'? O sinister interpreter of words! I was not concerned there with the question by what right the Spaniards possess Naples. One thing is certain: they possess it in such a manner that it leaves no room for others to rule there.

But turning suddenly witty, Zúñiga believes that I 'shall pay a high enough penalty' for this atrocious crime if he can show that I made 'a mistake in geography.'[360] He prefers leading Paul on a roundabout journey, bringing him from Mysia to the Troas, from there to Samothrace, from Samothrace back to Naples, and on to Philippi. How much weight this conjecture of Zúñiga's has I leave those to ponder who have time on their hands. I am content with what Jerome[361] says about place names in Acts: 'Naples,' he says, 'is a city in Caria, which belongs to the province of Asia.' Since Zúñiga cannot be unaware of this (for what can possibly escape his notice?) he should have argued with Jerome.

* * * * *

356 Naples had been claimed by Alfonso V of Aragon in 1442, but remained subject to rival claims until 1504, when it was incorporated into the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (ie Sicily and Naples) and ruled until 1715 by Spanish viceroys.

357 Those are Zúñiga's words. He claimed that Spain held Naples 'by hereditary right and an apostolic privilege.'

358 Lucian *Eunuchos* 2

359 Ie a barbarian.

360 Erasmus had incorrectly located the city (the port of Philippi) in Caria rather than on the border between Macedonia and Thracia.

361 Jerome *De nominibus locorum*, a work now ascribed to Bede PL 92 1033–40. Erasmus himself had doubts about the ascription to Jerome (see LB VI 495 E).

From chapter 17 [on Acts 17:30]

Et tempora quidem huius ignorantiae despiciens Deus [and God, overlooking the time of this ignorance]: The Greek for *despiciens* is *ὑπεριδών*. The Greek word sounds as if you said 'looking above and beyond,' and *despicit* is used of one who regards something from above, as it were. In the same manner a man who pretends not to see a matter that is negligible raises his eyes above it. For this reason, I had added in my note: 'But the Translator seems to have taken *ὑπεριδών* to mean "regarding from above."' Zúñiga, however, denies that this was his meaning and says that he used *despiciens* in the sense of 'despising.' I would have suspected that very thing, except that 'despising' does not fit the context at all. For God did not despise idolatry but rather overlooked it for a time, leaving the idolaters to their errors. And when Guarino[362] translates *ὑπεριδόντες* by *contemnentes* [despising] it would perhaps have been more correct to say *dissimulantes* [overlooking] – although I do not deny that he who overlooks something despises it in some respect; but in this passage the word *contemnere* was not at all suitable.

From chapter 18 [on Acts 18:3]

Erant enim scenefactoriae artis [for they were skilled tent makers]: I translated[363] *σκηνοποιοὶ* by *auleorum texendorum artifices* [skilled makers of tarpaulins]. Zúñiga demonstrates at great length that *σκηναί* means 'tents' and that they were usually made of hides. I knew that Paul was sometimes called a tanner by the Greeks,[364] but in Greek *σκηνή* can mean any cover for shade. Thus the word *scenae* is also used for curtains in plays. And, if I am not mistaken, *aulea* are something of this kind, as Horace indicates in his Epistles:[365] *Aulea Britannica cessant* [The British curtains are parting]. If Zúñiga contends that tents are made only 'of hides,' the custom of our time proves him wrong,

* * * * *

362 Zúñiga had pointed out that the Italian humanist Guarino of Verona (1374–1460) had translated the verb in Plutarch *Brutus* 2.8 as *contemnentes* (despising).

363 Ie in his annotations; in the text Erasmus translated *erat autem ars illorum texere aulaea* (they practiced the art of sewing tarpaulins). In the second edition he replaced *aulaea* (tarpaulins) with *tabernacula* (tents).

364 See for example Origen *Comm in Rom* PG 14 1279A, where Rufinus' Latin translation renders Greek *σκηνοποιοί* as *sutores* (leather-workers), and Chrysostom *Hom de laudibus Pauli* 4 PG 50 490, where Paul is referred to as 'a man skilled in working hides.' Zúñiga quoted the latter passage.

365 These words do not appear in Horace. Erasmus seems to conflate Virgil *Georgics* 3.25 (*tollant aulaea Britanni*, Britons will lift the curtains) and Horace *Epistles* 2.1.189 (*aulea premuntur*, the curtains are dropped).

for canvas is the most commonly used material. And among the Spaniards, leather curtains are in use, so that there is nothing that need offend Zúñiga. And yet I also made mention of tents in the second edition.

From chapter 19 [on Acts 19:9]

In schola tyranni cuiusdam [in the hall of a certain Tyrannus/tyrant]: I noted that the Translator was uncertain whether *tyrannus* in this passage was a proper name or denoted some powerful magnate. I prefer it to mean magnate. Furthermore, *schola* means leisure and a retreat where one is usually at leisure – for this is how Zúñiga quotes my words.[366] Zúñiga prefers to take *tyrannus* as the proper name of a person because he discovered that there was someone of this name in Seneca.[367] Let Zúñiga then enjoy his opinion. For I translated it in such a way that he was at liberty to do so.[368]

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 19:24]

Demetrius autem nomine argentarius [a silversmith named Demetrius]: Since the Greek reads *ἀργυροκόπος* and the Latin *argentarius* denotes a money changer rather than a craftsman skilled in working silver or casting it, I preferred to translate *aurifaber*.[369] Zúñiga thinks that there is a great difference between gold and silver – nor do I deny it. The craftsmen, however, share one name. Indeed, working gold and silver is part of the same trade. We say *aurifex* – we do not say *argentifex*. Furthermore, his critical comment, made in passing, that *ἀργυροκόπος* 'is derived, not from striking silver, but from working it,' is not plausible, for 'I work' is *κοπιάζω* or *κοπιάω* in Greek.[370] As for the rest, *κόπτω* means not only 'cut' but also 'beat, knock, strike.'

Ibidem, note 3 [on Acts 19:35]

Viri Ephesii, quis est hominum qui nesciat [Ephesians, what man is there who does not know] etc: Since the Greek here is *νεωκόρον*, I translate *cultricem*

* * * * *

366 Quoting Erasmus, Zúñiga had used the spelling *occium* and *occiari*. Erasmus preferred the common spelling *ocium, ociari*. See n29 above.

367 Seneca *De brevitate vitae* 20.3

368 In the second edition, however, Erasmus capitalized 'Tyrannus.'

369 Literally 'a worker in gold,' but as Erasmus explains, used of workers in precious metals generally, but in the third edition (1522) he switched the translation to the more precise *faber argentarius*, silversmith.

370 The verb *κοπιάζω* is not documented. This is probably an error for *κοπάζω*.

[custodian, worshipper], as did the Translator.[371] I was only mistaken in the etymology of the word *νεωκόρος*, for I was under the impression that it was derived from *νεώς*, temple, and *κόρη*, virgin (for the poets conceive of Diana as a virgin),[372] whereas it is derived from *νεώς*, temple, and *κορεῖν*, that is, 'cleanse' or 'scour,' as Hesychius and Suida teach.[373] But I soon corrected this human error in the second edition – lest Zúñiga celebrate a triumph here.

As for the rest, I added that the epithet *κόρη* [virgin] is given to Diana and Proserpina[374] in different senses, nor are they one and the same goddess, as Zúñiga suspects; rather it is given to Proserpina as a by-name. Diana is certainly credited with virginity. As for Zúñiga concluding in his epilogue that the Translator had rendered *νεωκόρον* correctly by *cultricem*, I myself approved of it and translated it in a similar manner – the difficulty was only with *κόρη*, and I soon recognized and corrected the problem.[375]

From chapter 24 [on Acts 24:5]

Invenimus hunc hominem pestiferum [we found this pestilential man]: I note that the Greek text has *λοιμόν*, that is, 'plague,' not condemning the Translator's version (for I myself translate it in the same way), but pointing out the Greek figure which exists in Latin too,[376] by which we call a pestilential person a 'pest,' a criminal person a 'crime.'[377] That this was my meaning is obvious from what I add: 'just as they call a ruinous person *ὄλεθρον*, that is, "a ruin."' Here Zúñiga heaps up evidence to demonstrate that *λοιμόν* sometimes means 'noxious.'[378] But I pointed out the figure of speech for the very purpose of demonstrating this. Moreover, he had no cause for emending what we read in Psalm 1,[379] *et in cathedra pestilentiae non sedit* [nor sits in the seat of pestilence] – as if it were corrupt – and instructing us to read *in*

* * * * *

371 The full sentence runs: 'Ephesians, what man is there who does not know that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess Diana?'

372 For example, Homer *Odyssey* 6.109, Virgil *Aeneid* 4.511

373 This mistake had been pointed out by Zúñiga. See Hesychius *Lexicon* ed. K. Latte (Copenhagen 1966) 2 708; Suida *Lexicon* ed. A. Adler (Leipzig 1933) 3 453.

374 Diana, Roman goddess most often depicted as ranging through the woods as a huntress; Proserpina, Greek goddess forcibly abducted by the God of the Underworld, associated with life/death/rebirth

375 In the second edition (1519)

376 That is, metonymy

377 For example, Cicero *Epistolae ad familiares* 10.28.1, *In Verrem* 2.1.15

378 Zúñiga has a point in the sense that *λοιμός* can be both an adjective and a noun, so that the designation 'figure of speech' is somewhat questionable.

379 Ps 1:1

cathedra pestilentium [in the seat of the pestilent man]. For if *λοιμός* is sometimes used of a pestilent man, it does not follow that the meaning 'pestilence' is not the more frequent one.

From chapter 27 [on Acts 27:40]

Et sublato[380] *artemone* [when the mainsail had been hoisted]: In the text I adopted the Translator's version, retaining the word Luke used in Greek: *ἀρτέμων*. Thus there is no problem here, except that for the purpose of explanation I translate the word in the annotation by *antemna* [pole, sailyard]. Here Zúñiga contends that *artemon* is a Latin rather than a Greek word, though borrowed by Luke, who spoke in Greek; and that this was nothing new since we read in the evangelists *δηνάριον, κῆνσον, λέντιον, σικαρίων, κουστωδίαν*.[381] But while Zúñiga strongly asserts this, he fails to offer equally strong proof. For since the Latins[382] explain that *artemon* is a machine suitable for hoisting up loads, it is plausible that the word is derived from Greek *αἴρω* or *ἀρτάω*; for this reason I suspect that it was [what is called in Latin] an *antemna*, used here by sailors as a machine for taking down or hoisting up sails. The context makes us think of sails spread to the winds, so that the ship is dashed against the shore with even greater force, and this is the very effect of the raised *antemna* to which the sail is attached. But, [one might say], from the jurists cited by Zúñiga [383]it is obvious that *artemon* is not the same as *antemna*, which is undoubtedly part of the ship, no less than the mast. Yet it is possible that Luke used the word in the sense of *antemna*, for it closely resembles the machine with which they hoist freight that is to be loaded onto or unloaded from ships, so that today there are practically no other machines in use but *antemnae*. Zúñiga, however, distrusts all Greek and Latin manuscripts and is of the opinion that we must read *antemone* for *artemone* because Perotti of Siponto[384] wrote that *antemon* is 'a sail that can easily be turned and which

* * * * *

380 The Vulgate has *levato* (hoisted), not *sublato* which appears in Erasmus' annotation on the passage.

381 The first four loanwords were cited by Zúñiga from Mark 12:15, Mark 12:14, John 13:4, Acts 21:38; Erasmus himself added the fifth example from Matt 27:65–6.

382 Vitruvius 10.2.9

383 Zúñiga had borrowed his arguments and evidence from Nebrija's *Tertia Quinquagena* 2, without acknowledging his source. He also cited the jurist Iavolenus (fl. 100 AD) *Digesta* 50.16.242.

384 Niccolò Perotti (1430–80), bishop of Siponto, in his *Cornucopiae*, an encyclopedic commentary on Martial often used as a thesaurus

sailors use at the crucial time of a storm.' Yet, distrusting Perotti as well (for Perotti cites no author – a fault to which that gentleman, otherwise so scholarly, succumbs rather often) Zúñiga delegates to scholars the task of inquiring into this matter more diligently. In my opinion the text need not be changed here. For since it is agreed that *artemon* is a machine made to hoist loads, and sailors use *antemnae* for the same purpose, I do not see why it would be absurd to assume that the term is used here in the sense of *antemna*. But if *artemon* is a sail, as Beda explains,[385] it will be appropriate to think of a sail attached to an *antemna* which is very easily turned. For there are other kinds of sails which are spread with ropes, not with an *antemna*.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Acts 27:44]

Quosdam super ea, quae erant de navi [some on objects that came from the ship]: Because he had said earlier on that some reached land on planks, and shortly thereafter added 'and some on objects that came from the ship' – although the planks too came from the ship – it should either have been phrased 'on *other* objects that came from the ship' or the specific object that belonged to the ship should have been stated. I therefore translated *fragmenta navis* [parts of the ship]. Zúñiga says that the ship was not broken up. Yet Paul[386] says that 'the prow was loosened by the force of the waves.' And nothing prevents us from calling oars, mast, mainsail, gangways, and the like 'parts of the ship' which are helpful in the case of shipwreck, even if the ship is not broken up. Nor would Zúñiga's interpretation have displeased me (he suggests that we take this as a reference to containers and nautical instruments)[387] – except for the problem I indicated.

From the Epistle to the Romans [on Rom 1:3]

De filio suo qui factus est ei [concerning his son who was made from him]: Although the Greek reads *γενομένου*, Lorenzo [Valla] prefers *genitus* to *factus*. I indicate that *γενομένου* in Greek does not have the specific meaning of being born, saying: 'It would certainly mean "born" if the text had *γεννηθείς*.' Then, why do you translate 'who was born,' Zúñiga asks. Because 'made' sounds awkward to Latin ears, especially when the meaning is that he became man from David's family at a specific time, whereas he was God from God before

* * * * *

385 Beda in the *Ordinary Gloss* on Acts 27:40 writes that it is 'a sail more apt to steer the ship than to speed it up.'
386 A mistake for 'Luke.' The reference is to Acts 27:41.
387 Zúñiga suggested amphoras and jars rather than nautical instruments.

all time. Furthermore, he who is born begins to exist in the flesh.[388] Thus I did not give a precise translation of the Greek word, but neither did I deviate from the meaning. Certainly Augustine[389] in *Against Faustus*, book 11, chapter 4, shows that in some manuscripts *natus* [born] was written for *factus* [made]. For Zúñiga criticizes in passing that I added 'or *natus*' on my own authority, whereas Valla had only *genitus*.

I had indicated that the pronoun [*ei*, for him] found in Latin manuscripts is not added in any Greek texts. Zúñiga indicates that it is 'not added in the oldest Latin manuscripts either.'[390] And he concludes from this that, whereas I 'diligently' consulted the old manuscripts 'for the gospels,' 'I seem to have consulted them rarely or not at all' for the rest. On the contrary, I was much more diligent as far as the rest goes, but there is a larger number of gospel manuscripts than for the rest; indeed, when the New Testament was first printed, I had only one copy of the apostolic letters,[391] but of venerable age and wonderfully correct. Since this is often cited by me in the *Annotations*, I wonder why Zúñiga finds me wanting in diligence.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Rom 1:25]

Qui est benedictus [who is blessed]: For the sake of less experienced readers I translate *laudandus* [praiseworthy], for the common people believe that *benedicere* means to make the sign of the cross or to wish well. 'I wonder,' says Zúñiga, 'who these less experienced readers are who were offended by *benedictus*?' There was no risk of them being offended, but rather of them not understanding Paul's meaning. 'But,' says Zúñiga, 'Greek *εὐλογεῖν* means "to bless" not "to praise," thus *εὐλογητός* means "blessed," not "praiseworthy."' This is like saying *εὐπαθεῖν* in Greek means 'to experience good things,' not 'to be done a favour.' When we so often say *benedicite, omnia opera Domini, Dominum* [All you works of the Lord, bless the Lord][392] – do we not understand this to mean praise for the maker on account of the things he made?

* * * * *

388 Alluding to the Nicene Creed 'true God from true God, begotten, not made'

389 Augustine *Contra Faustum* 11.4 PL 42 248

390 In fact, a number of Latin manuscripts had the pronoun; thus some modern editions have retained it.

391 See Ep 373 22–5. This so-called Codex Paulinus had been lent to Erasmus by John Colet.

392 A canticle used in the Catholic Liturgy of the Hours. *Dominum* should read *Domino.*

And it is a fine thing that after declaring that *εὐλογητός* means *benedictus* he adduces the phrase *benedictus Dominus, Deus Israel*[393] – as if I did not know or denied that *εὐλογητός* is translated in this way in Scripture a thousand times. My question was: what meaning does *benedictus* have for Latin speakers? I would wish that *benedictus* in the sense of 'praised' were Latin.

From chapter 2 [on Rom 2:17]

Si autem tu Iudaeus [If however you are called a Jew]: I had shown that there are two variants in the Greek texts. Some have *εἰ δέ*, that is, 'if however'; others *ἰδέ*, that is, 'behold.' There is no difference between the two in pronunciation, but there is in the spelling. I prefer the second variant because it connects more smoothly with what follows. Zúñiga prefers the first, citing Origen[394] from whose words in the Latin translation it is not quite clear what he read, and from the words of 'Athanasius' it is even less clear.[395] For under this name Zúñiga often adduces Theophylact, being very pleased with himself because this author recently appeared in a new Latin translation. But Zúñiga has been deceived by the title which was falsely added. Since there is a huge difference between Athanasius' style – a wonderfully eloquent writer among the Greeks – and Theophylact's, it is surprising that a man who is so perceptive in other respects (or so he thinks) did not realize this, and although Theophylact is cited by me everywhere under the name of 'Vulgarius,'[396] he did not realize that the author whom I called 'Vulgarius' and he 'Athanasius'[397] were one and the same, especially when I occasionally quote some lines from the Greek. Afterwards I got hold of the Greek volume and found *εἰ δέ*, that is, 'but if' written in the text, although the commentary indicated nothing new.

From chapter 3 [on Rom 3:5]

Si autem iniquitas nostra iusticiam Dei [constituit] [But if our unrighteousness confirms the righteousness of God]: Since in Greek there is an attractive repetition of related words, *ἀδικία δικαιοσύνην*, I translated it such that the

* * * * *

393 The Vulgate translation of Luke 1:68

394 Origen *Comm in Rom* 2.11 PG 14 895C. Erasmus is quibbling. The passage would indicate that the reading was *ei de.*

395 Athanasius, that is, Theophylact *Comm in Rom* 2:17 PG 124 373A, which Zúñiga cites in a Latin translation. From the Latin text he inferred that the Greek reading was *εἰ δέ.*

396 On this confusion see n122 above.

397 See n258 above.

effect would not be lost: *si iniusticia nostra Dei iusticiam constituit*. Zúñiga acts as if I had rejected the word *iniquitas*,[398] even though I think that *iusticia* here stands for justice in a general sense, which makes men good. For the Jews call good, saintly, upright men 'just.'

Zúñiga shows that *συνίστησι* can reasonably be translated by *commendat* [commends], as I myself somewhere do.[399] What Zúñiga explains here, I myself explain in the second edition, clearly stating that the Translator's version does not displease me.[400] *Constituit*, however, stands for 'establish' or 'confirm, corroborate,' for that is the meaning of *συνίστησι*, as Origen[401] himself explains a little later.

From chapter 5 [on Rom 5:13]

Peccatum autem non imputabatur [But sin was not imputed]: The Greek runs *ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου*, which I translated: 'Moreover, sin is not imputed when there is no law.' Although all Greek manuscripts agree, Zúñiga nevertheless thinks that there is an error and that one ought to write *ἐλλογεῖτο* in the imperfect tense for *ἐλλογεῖται* in the present tense. And he is influenced – so this perceptive gentleman tells us – by the fact that he has discovered it 'from the manner of the expression itself.'[402] 'The Translator,' he says, translated 'was imputed' and would not have done so if the text had read *ἐλλογεῖται*. And supposing what the Translator wrote was corrupted by the copyists? For it would be a fine thing to turn matters upside down and correct the Greek on the basis of the Latin, that is, 'put the cart before the horse,' according to the Greek adage.[403]

But whatever the Translator read, he certainly did not read what Zúñiga suggests – *ἐλλογεῖτο* – a word no one skilled in the Greek language will recognize. For since *ἐλλογοῦμαι* is composed of the preposition *ἐν-* and *λογέομαι*, the '*ν*' which was turned into an '*λ*,' must be restored when an augmental vowel is interposed, and one must say *ἐνελογεῖτο* after the example of *ἐκκόπτω ἐξέκοπτον*, *ἐμμένω ἐνέμεινα*, *ἐκκρούω ἐξέκρουον*. Since this is known even to boys who have just begun to learn Greek, I am surprised that it did

* * * * *

398 Zúñiga had merely noted that *iniquitas* was a correct translation.

399 At Rom 5:8, as Zúñiga had pointed out

400 In the second edition (1519) Erasmus added to his note 'although *commendat* is also a correct translation.'

401 Origen *Comm in Rom* on 3:31 PG 14 957B

402 Zúñiga had argued that the apostle was using the past tense throughout the verse.

403 *Adagia* I vii 28

not occur to Zúñiga who in his preface spoke so splendidly of himself as having approached this task equipped with everything. And that man advises me somewhere 'to remember that I am human.' Although he reminds the mindful,[404] I should like at this point to advise him in turn to remember that he is not God. For he considers it an insult that somewhere, in the context of disagreeing with Jerome, I say that he is human.[405]

But to return to the matter at hand, there is no reason why the present tense should offend us, even if the phrase refers to the past. For the present tense is used in a way that applies to any time: 'Sin is not imputed if there is no law,' that is, it is customary not to impute it, or it ought not to be imputed. As we say: 'The prosecutor is not heard unless the accused is present.'[406]

Moreover, if the Translator translated 'imputed' or if the exegetes speak in the same manner, looking back to a time at which the Mosaic law had not yet been given, there is no cause for surprise or for changing the Greek text. And I rather suspect that the text in our manuscripts was corrupted, for in one very old manuscript, which was shown to me in the College of St Donatian at Bruges,[407] I found written: *quum lex non est* [when there is no law], from which one can guess that the text ran 'the law is not imputed.'[408] Another point in my favour is the fact that in Greek the article is not added (*μὴ ὄντος νόμου*) so that just as *ὄντος* refers to any time, so *νόμου* refers to any law, not only to that of Moses.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Rom 5:19]

Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius [For as by disobedience of one]: Since it would not affect the meaning whether you read *κατεστήθησαν*,[409] that is, 'they were made,' or *κατεστήθημεν*, 'we were made,' I followed the text in the Greek manuscripts, which is also found in the Aldine edition.[410]

* * * * *

404 *Adagia* I ii 12

405 In his annotation on Matt 26:31

406 See the *Decretum* of Gratian (c 1140), Pars II, Causa 3, Quaestio 9.1: *Nisi re presente accusator non audiatur* (unless the accused is present, the accuser shall not be heard). See also Acts 25:16.

407 For the third edition (1522) Erasmus used five Latin manuscripts of the New Testament at the College of St Donatian at Bruges, where he stayed in August 1521. The manuscripts have not been identified.

408 'Law' should read 'sin.'

409 This should read *κατεστάθησαν.* Erasmus' text had yet another misprint, *καθεστάθησαν.*

410 Erasmus did not realize that the Greek Aldine (Venice 1518) largely reproduced his own text, including the faulty *καθεστάθησαν.*

But, [one might say], in the following section we find *καταστήσονται*, that is, 'they will be made.' It is nothing new to see that Paul changed the person,[411] and it makes more sense that Paul should transfer to his own person what was rather offensive and to others what was praiseworthy.

From chapter 6 [on Rom 6:22]

Finem autem vitam aeternam [the end, however, eternal life]: Here it is obvious that Erasmus is 'raving mad,' if we believe Zúñiga's marginal summary. For in the text *fructum* had been printed for *finem*.[412] What is really obvious here is the carelessness of the typesetter. For how dare Zúñiga attribute this error to me when in my annotation I cite the text as the Translator renders it, nor do I criticize anything in this expression, nor do I make any mention of the word *fructum*. Let him think this was my doing if he does not see it changed in the second edition.

From chapter 7 [on Rom 7:3]

Igitur vivente viro adultera vocabitur [therefore, while her husband is alive, she will be called an adulteress]: What he translates as *vocabitur* [will be called] is *χρηματίσει* in Greek. I translated it *iudicabitur* [will be judged]. Zúñiga says that it can also be translated in the way the Translator did. I do not deny this. Why then did I prefer *iudicabitur*? Because I saw that *χρηματίζεσθαι*[413] in Greek means 'to pronounce judgment' or 'give a response,' hence *χρηματισμός*, 'oracle' or 'royal edict.' Since here he means that she must be thus called by the verdict of the judges, I preferred *iudicabitur* to *vocabitur*. As for the unexpected use of *χρηματίσει* in the active voice, it is a Greek idiom. They say *ἐχρημάτισε ῥήτωρ*, meaning 'he was considered an orator' or 'claimed to be an orator'; similarly, they say in Latin *audit pater*, *audit philosophus* for 'he is called a father,' 'he is said to be a philosopher.' Girolamo Aleandro[414] pointed this out to me – lest I deprive anyone of his credit.

And it is ridiculous that Zúñiga suspects me of thinking that *χρηματίσει* was derived from *κρῖμα* rather than *χρῆμα*, as if I did not know the difference between *χ* and *κ*, between *η* and *ι*. I would sooner have suspected that

* * * * *

411 See Origen in PG 14, Index analyticus, which has an entry on Paul 'suddenly and covertly introducing and varying the Person,' as pointed out by Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-2 169).

412 The mistake was corrected in the second edition (1519).

413 But Rom 7:3 uses the active form, that is, the verb *χρηματίζειν*.

414 See n112 above.

'Zúñiga' was derived from *stiva* [plough handle]. With annotations of this kind he makes good his magnificent promises and his vainglorious prefaces, which are foolish talk.

From chapter 8 [on Rom 8:15]

In quo clamamus: Abba, Pater [Whereby we cry Abba, Father]: Here I run into the same stumbling block again, saying 'Hebrew word' instead of 'Syriac.' And in the second edition I state, on Jerome's authority, that the word *Abba* is Syriac.[415]

As for the rest of what Zúñiga says, that I suspect *ὁ πατήρ* [father] could be taken only for a nominative case, he is plainly slandering me. For if *ὁ πατήρ* is added for the sake of explanation, it will be the nominative case. If it serves the purpose of repetition, it will be the vocative case. And I have put down both alternatives, a fact which Zúñiga disregards, seeking an opportunity to criticize something.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Rom 8:30]

Quos autem justificavit, illos et magnificavit [and whom he justified he also glorified]: Since it is *ἐδόξασε* in Greek, I translated *glorificavit* rather than *magnificavit*. Zúñiga shows that *δοξάζω* is translated in different ways in Holy Writ. Of what concern is this to me? I have no quarrel with it, but *glorifico* expresses the meaning of the Greek word more exactly than *magnifico*. For *magnifico* in the sense of 'extol' may be Latin but it is certainly a rare word.[416]

On Romans, chapter 9 [on Rom 9:25]

Zúñiga begins by giving me the usual honourable mention: 'how rarely' I study Holy Writ and 'how I have undertaken this task with unwashed feet,' and in the margin he adds this respectful comment: 'Erasmus is obviously raving.' Then he shows that the testimony adduced by Paul is not taken 'from the first chapter' of Hosea, as I had noted, but 'from diverse passages in this prophet,' since Paul stated the prophet's name, but did not give the chapter.[417] No wonder that Paul did not add the number of the chapter, for in his time there was no division into chapters, as we have it.

* * * * *

415 Jerome *Liber de nominibus Hebraeicis* PL 23 887/8 and 895/6
416 It is rare in classical Latin and used mostly by Christian authors.
417 Elements of the quotation appear at Hos 1:9, 1:10, and 2:24. Zúñiga had noted that it was a conflation.

Granted that I cited the first chapter of Hosea, but printers often make mistakes in numbers, and what great crime was it, considering that the passage appearing at the end of the second chapter derives from the passage in the first chapter as from a source,[418] since in the first chapter burdensome names are imposed and in the second chapter they are changed into others.

Also, since part of the prophecy is plainly taken from the first chapter, it is rather surprising that Zúñiga – such a clear-sighted man who is never blinded – seems to lapse twice a little further on: first, because he says that Jerome, commenting on the passage in question, cites two variants, whereas he does so in chapter 1 where the names are given,[419] a matter of which he makes no mention at the end of the second chapter; secondly, because he cites out of Jerome what is not there, for Jerome has only these words: 'for *οὐκ ἠλεημένην*, that is, without pity, some manuscripts have *οὐκ ἠγαπημένην*, that is, not loved.' Zúñiga cites it in this manner: *καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην, ἠγαπημένην, καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠλεημένην, ἠλεημένην*. And it does not escape me that Zúñiga will blame me for the error because I was the first to cite it in this form. I acknowledge my mistake, a human one, that often creeps in when men are occupied with many different things or in a hurry – and I was subject to both conditions at the time.[420] But in order to correct such mistakes, which I admitted right away were found in the first edition, I prepared a third edition long before I was able to obtain Zúñiga's book. I am surprised, however, that such an Argus[421] with eyes everywhere was willing to trust a leader who 'raves' passim instead of rereading at least the passage in Jerome cited and indicated by me. From this incident it is quite obvious how assiduously he studies the holy books when he raves in this manner concerning a passage pointed out to him, especially when the desire to criticize usually makes sharp-eyed Lynceuses out of bleary-eyed men.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Rom 11:4]

Reliqui mihi septem milia virorum [I have reserved for myself seven thousand men]: Here Zúñiga brings a triple accusation against me, and that regarding Hebrew, although it would have been fairer at least to divide the charges between myself and my helper. I wrote *Baal* with an *aleph*, when

* * * * *

418 See preceding note.
419 Jerome *Comm in Hos* CCL 76 17 on Hosea 1:10–11
420 For this excuse see also pp 28 and 29 above.
421 Argus, in Greek mythology a giant with a hundred eyes, proverbially used to denote an unusually suspicious person, according to Erasmus' *Adagia* I v 74

it should have been spelled with an *ain*. Secondly, I wrote that Beelphegor meant 'idol of a corpse' when it was rather the 'idol of a gaping mouth.'[422] Next [he criticizes me] because I say Beelsebul instead of Beelzebub. I shall reply to the last point, leaving the rest to him whose business it is and whom Zúñiga shall not find mute.[423] He ought not to blame me if I adduced a Hebrew word in corrupt fashion, if Paul, himself a Hebrew by birth, wrote in corrupt fashion.[424] And perhaps at that time the people of Syria pronounced it in the manner in which Paul wrote it.

Ibidem, note 3 [on Rom 11:11]

Sed illorum delicto salus est gentibus, ut illos emulentur [But through their fall salvation has come to the gentiles, that they might emulate them]: The Translator's version either makes no sense or is absurd. Indeed if 'gentiles' is the subject of 'emulate,' it makes no sense. The Latin phrase does not suggest this to anyone. If 'Jews' is the subject, the meaning is absurd, for they do not prompt the gentiles [to emulate them] but rather alienate them.[425] But Origen and Theophylact (whom Zúñiga cites as 'Athanasius')[426] explain that the gentiles were admitted to the grace of the gospel that by their example the Jews might be recalled to Christ, so to speak, envying the gentiles, whom they were holding in great contempt. Although Zúñiga cites their interpretation himself, he nevertheless added in his marginal summary: 'The Greek has not been understood at all by Erasmus.' And in his note he treats the subject in a way that makes it obvious that he understood neither the Latin nor the Greek. He says there are two meanings that, however, come out to one and the same, and he proposes one, omitting the other, seemingly understanding neither.[427] Read Zúñiga's nonsense, dear reader, and the matter

* * * * *

422 The verse runs 'I have reserved for myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed their knees to the idol of Baal.' Oecolampadius thought that Beelphegor and Beelzebul were derivations of Baal and explained that Beelphegor meant 'idol of a cadaver.' Zúñiga had pointed out that the etymology was wrong and that Belphegor meant 'idol of the gaping mouth.'

423 Oecolampadius refrained from writing against Zúñiga.

424 The -bul ending is indeed the common ending in the New Testament, although the word does not occur in Paul's Epistles, as Erasmus mistakenly claims.

425 The subject is 'salvation,' which has come to the gentiles to stir the Jews to emulation, as explained by Origen and Theophylact. See the following note.

426 Origen *Comm in Rom* PG 14 1184B–C; Theophylact *Comm in Rom,* PG 124 488B–C. For Zúñiga referring to Theophylact as 'Athanasius,' see n258 above.

427 Zúñiga had in fact referred to both authors, although his interpretation of their words is questionable.

itself will confirm the truth of what I am saying. I shall not waste any effort on refuting this drivel.

But this fellow with a knack for rhetoric makes me unpopular by using the figure of anticipation,[428] saying that I 'openly accuse Thomas, the most famous doctor of the church, of inexperience.' Just how celebrated a doctor of the church Thomas is[429] I let others decide. I suppose it is permitted at any rate to disagree with him.[430] Yet Zúñiga says that I 'insult' the man when in this passage at least I make excuses for his manifest error, for I conclude my note in this manner: 'which must not be imputed to him at all, but rather to the Translator.' Does he who shifts the blame to the Translator in order to acquit Thomas 'insult' Thomas?

But not content with this, my friend Zúñiga even accuses me of breaking my promise, for I promised to cover up the faults of the doctors and am not living up to my promise. What I actually said was that I would cover up faults in some cases and offer justifications or polite disagreement in others.[431] In this passage I certainly offer a justification. Nor does Zúñiga speak up for love of Thomas, whom he does not seem to have read, but to satisfy those by whom he has been suborned to carry on this travesty.[432]

Ibidem, note 4 [on Rom 11:22]

Vide ergo bonitatem Dei [behold therefore the goodness of God]: The Translator, reading *ἴδε*, translated *vide*; I, reading *ἰδέ*, translate *ecce*. The meaning remains the same, whichever reading you choose, nor is there any

* * * * *

428 This figure of speech applies to someone stating what he professes not to state, as in the expression 'not to mention' which Zúñiga had used before mentioning that Erasmus had insulted Thomas Aquinas.

429 Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) was the mainstay of scholastic theologians and as such became the butt of humanistic satire. See, for example, Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 127: 'You'd extricate yourself faster from a labyrinth than from the tortuous obscurities of Realists, Nominalists, Thomists, Albertists, Ockhamists, and Scotists.' See also the scornful mention in *Ciceronianus* CWE 28 414: Thomas 'reveals the least command of language precisely when he makes an attempt at fluency and fine writing … but that's enough of those scholastic theologians. You will look in vain for any eloquence from them.'

430 In his annotation on the passage, Erasmus had written: 'There was no need for the fourfold interpretation which Thomas Aquinas applied to this passage; he did not even touch on the genuine meaning.'

431 See his *Apologia* CWE 41 473–4.

432 For this standard accusation see also Ep 1216:16–17 and passim in Erasmus' controversies.

difficulty, except that the adverb is more forceful. What then is the point of Zúñiga's quibbling?[433]

From chapter 12 [on Rom 12:6]

Sed habentes donationes [but having gifts], *χαρίσματα* in Greek: Since *donationes* is not a word that is used in Latin for gifts or offerings, I preferred *dona* and criticized the Translator in one or two words for 'affecting *copia*'[434] without good reason. Here my friend Zúñiga starts with another preamble, or rather repeats the first one, a fine piece indeed that bears repeating. 'Twice and three times over what is beautiful'![435] He says that this passage makes it clear that I did not undertake my work out of any feeling of charity nor a desire to be helpful but only for thirst of glory (which is the one emotion, as Flaccus[436] says, 'that lights a fire in the mind and spirit') and from a desire to criticize, for I reprehend minute details in the Translator 'rightly or wrongly,' as Pindar says.[437] I would give my holiest oath that Zúñiga added this preface for no other reason than to find an occasion to use the two adages he had perhaps read only recently in Flaccus and Pindar. Otherwise what is there that would merit such a preamble? The rest is too insipid to recite here.

From chapter 15 [on Rom 15:24]

Cum in Hispaniam proficisci coepero [When I set out for Spain]: When I saw that in the Greek books *Σπανία* was consistently written for *Ἱσπανία*, I wondered why this had happened and added these words: 'As for the rest, the Greeks deprive *Ἱσπανία* of its first syllable, whereas the Spaniards are accustomed to add a letter to words of this kind, saying *espero* for *spero*, *especto* for *specto*.' I had said something similar in my note on Matthew:[438] 'Nor is it Scariotes,' I said, 'as it is found in our manuscripts, but *Iscariotes*. For the Latins treat the name of Judas in the same fashion as the Greeks treat *Ἱσπανία*, pronouncing it *Σπανία*, although according to Pliny the land is exceptionally fertile.'[439] You see, dear reader, there is nothing here that could arouse anger, yet it is amazing what tempests Zúñiga stirs up.

* * * * *

433 Nevertheless Erasmus switched to *vide* in later editions.
434 *Copia* here means variation, ie the Vulgate Translator used various Latin words to translate the same Greek word.
435 *Adagia* I ii 49
436 Valerius Flaccus 1.76
437 Pindar *Olympia* 2.16
438 In his annotation on Matt 10:2
439 A pun on *Spania* which resembles *spanis*, 'want, lack.' The reference is to Pliny *Naturalis historia* 37.203.

First he castigates my exceptional ignorance of Greek for thinking that the word for 'Spain' is a trisyllabic word for all Greeks, when it has four syllables in the books of the Maccabees and in Suida. Zúñiga does not realize that I am not dealing here with just any Greek books but am comparing the Pauline epistles in Greek with the Latin translation. And although the Greek text has *Σπανία*, the Latin Translator rendered it *Hispania*. If Paul wrote *Σπανία*, it is likely that it was commonly pronounced in this manner; if the text is corrupt, let Zúñiga proffer one manuscript that has a different reading. Similarly, I speak about the name *Iscariotes*, not dealing with the other Greek books but with the gospels written in Greek and translated into Latin. There was no reason here why Zúñiga should accuse me of ignorance of Greek authors.

Who does not know that almost every single region has peculiarities of pronunciation, for example, the 's' being elided in France, the 'e' sounding like 'i' in England, *corpus* being pronounced *chorpus* in Florence, *laudo* sometimes being pronounced *laldo*? But this does not disturb scholars, yet Zúñiga carries on here, saying that I pronounce the whole Spanish people guilty of ignorance because some Spaniards pronounce *spero* '*espero*.' But I shall quote Zúñiga's own words to make the fellow's impudence more obvious. He says: 'As for him making a passing remark, accusing the Spaniards of ignorance and saying that they write *espero* for *spero*, *especto* for *specto*, one need not be surprised that a Dutchman suffers from envy of the most noble Spaniards, seeing that they derive their origin from the Greeks and Romans. And since he cannot possibly accuse us of poverty, idleness, and sloth, as we live in a land that is rich in all the amenities of life and in a most affluent and fertile region and as we surpass almost all mortals in the arts of war and in power – a fact that has been well known for a long time to all the world – he purposely imputes ignorance of letters to us.'

First of all Zúñiga is talking idly when he says that I criticized the Spaniards because they 'wrote' *espero* for *spero*; I said 'pronounced.' And perhaps it is not pronounced like this by all, generally speaking, but it is at any rate pronounced like this by some, and not only by Spaniards but also by the French who live on the Spanish border. But does this mean that I condemn all of Spain as being ignorant? Are all Spaniards scholars?

Moreover, why does he mention 'poverty, idleness, and sloth'? If Spain were not a fertile land, would any scholar and gentleman criticize Spain for it? Does Spain alone have no poor men? Are all Spaniards Croesuses and Midases?[440] Does it have no idlers? No layabouts? But why mention all this?

* * * * *

440 Classical paradigms of wealth

Only because the man sought an opportunity to sing the praises of his beloved Spain. And for this he could find no more auspicious point of departure, in his opinion, than by detracting from the reputation of others. What does he mean by 'Dutchman,' a term he impresses on us so many times?[441] Is it a crime to be a Dutchman? What are scholars to think when they read what he wrote – a man who professes to have perfect knowledge of Holy Writ?

Thus he proceeds to sing the praises of Spain – and however much he extols her virtues, I wish her even greater blessings. If only good literature flourished everywhere to such a degree, if only zeal for piety would be rekindled everywhere to such a degree that we Dutchmen could seem to be uneducated and lacking in piety! In that respect there is no land I do not wish well. But I wish Spain particularly well because it once gave us great scholars or because we enjoy a common ruler – except that Zúñiga will begrudge this to the Dutch. Furthermore, the name of Antonio Nebrija[442] is so famous and so welcome to us all because we see that he has done a great deal for scholarship and continues to do so. The more scholars come forth from his school, as from the Trojan Horse,[443] the more we shall rejoice.

Achilles seemed fortunate to Alexander the Great because he had Homer to praise him.[444] Spain would seem to me no less fortunate if it had to make do without Zúñiga as herald of its glory, or if it had not brought forth so spiteful a man, darkening another country's glory. This encomiast was unable to praise his own Spain without doing injury to other regions. 'The Spaniards,' he says, 'came to such a pinnacle of erudition that they could no doubt compete in the field of literature even with the Italians themselves who occupy the citadel of all humanistic disciplines as well as of virtue, and indeed with all other regions, among whom are found hardly two or three in our time who are zealous for good literature.' What words could be more arrogant? What more impudent? France has so many men endowed with exceptional knowledge, so has Germany, so has Flanders and Brabant, the region where I now live, so has Britain – men who stand comparison with even the writers of old.[445] There is no region where good literature does not flourish and reign supreme – and he says that there are 'hardly two or three who

* * * * *

441 See n9 above.
442 See n46 above.
443 An image used by Zúñiga, although perhaps not very appropriately, since the story that gave rise to the image (Greek soldiers, concealed in a gift horse, attacking Troy from within) would indicate danger.
444 According to Plutarch *Alexander* 15
445 For a list praising contemporary scholars see Ep 1111:28–53.

are zealous for literature.' To say nothing of the others: in the university of Louvain alone there are more than a thousand men who are not only zealous students of good literature,[446] but have made good progress in it, and among them not a few whose names will be famous in posterity. And no princely munificence invites them to these studies in Louvain. The chief representatives of the old learning fight them tooth and claw.[447] In this respect at least the Complutensian academy is more fortunate and would be no whit less fortunate if it had to make do without a spiteful man like Zúñiga.

And in passing he casts into my teeth that somewhere I take the opportunity to praise certain famous scholars, whom he contemptuously calls 'some Swiss nationals or other.'[448] In this respect I surpass Zúñiga's good will, for I do not only laud my own Dutchmen, but also Germans, Swiss, Frenchmen, and Englishmen, wherever in the world they are born, as long as they are deserving men. Indeed I have also praised Spaniards in my writings and would praise even Irishmen[449] if anyone worthy of praise appeared there.

But having reached the end of his encomium, Zúñiga concludes thus: 'Since this is so, there is no reason why Erasmus should insult Spaniards, as if they were uneducated and manifest barbarians.' I have no doubt that all Spaniards would detest such unbridled criticism if they are the men Zúñiga wishes them to appear. I certainly believe that there are many such men.

* * * * *

446 Erasmus estimated the total number of students at the University of Louvain at 3000 (Ep 1221:15), although the numbers at the time fluctuated between 1670 and 2190. In 1518 he had spoken in less complimentary terms of the University, where the theologians were hostile toward him. See Ep 886:52–4: 'Here I have nothing to hope for. Nowhere in the world are liberal studies more despised or worse looked after.' Yet, in 1521 (Ep 1237:20–2) he said that 'nowhere do the young show more enthusiasm for good literature and many of them make good progress, while the devotees of ancient ignorance protest in vain.'

447 Among Erasmus' personal opponents in Louvain were Nicolas Egmondanus, Vincent Theodorici, Jacobus Latomus, and for a while Maarten van Dorp and the Englishman Edward Lee, who studied at Louvain from 1516. These men are lampooned in a satire on the faculty of theology, *Dialogus Bilinguium et Trilinguium*, attributed to Konrad Nesen, Erasmus' admirer (text in CWE 7 335–47).

448 Ie Oecolampadius; see Ep 373:75–83.

449 The ancient cliché was to describe Irishmen as barbarians. See, for example, Strabo 4.201 and *Adagia* II iv 9.

From the Epistle to the Corinthians [on 1 Cor 1:11]

Ab his qui sunt Chloes [from those that are Chloe's]: I translate 'from the friends of Chloe,' according to the opinion of those who thought that Chloe was a noble woman from whose friends Paul learned what he is reporting. What I cited here out of the Greek text of Theophylact under the name 'Vulgarius,' Zúñiga explains out of the same author under the name 'Athanasius.'[450] 'One must know,' he says, as if he contributed something new. The rest of what he dreams up does not concern me.

From chapter 4 [on 1 Cor 4:3]

Mihi autem pro minimo est ut a vobis [It matters little to me whether by you] etc: Zúñiga thought it was time for a new preamble. For after the marginal summary 'A passage completely misunderstood by Erasmus' he gives this introduction: 'It is surprising how wrongheaded that Erasmus of Rotterdam is. For he does not understand a word of what he reads in St Jerome or other doctors of the church, as is apparent from this passage.' I shall explain briefly how little this harsh introduction accords with the truth. In the first edition of the *Annotations* I had written as follows: 'Jerome cites this passage somewhere to show that Paul's Greek was not very polished and that he had expressed some things in the Cilician fashion. For he was from Cilicia.' I shall quote Jerome's words in the epistle to Algasia, question 10:[451] 'I still uphold what I have said often before: that Paul's words "unskilled in speech, but not in understanding"[452] are not at all about humility but about the truth of inner knowledge. For language does not explain profound and recondite meanings. And since he himself realized that he could not use correct speech to pour into another man's ears what he wanted to say – while he was eloquent in the vernacular, being a Hebrew of Hebrew descent and having studied at the feet of Gamaliel,[453] a man most learned in law – he got entangled trying to explain himself.' Does not Jerome here openly declare that Paul knew less Greek than Hebrew because he had learned the latter from his elders and from a most learned teacher, the former from his contact with the Cilicians? Does he not confirm here what he shows elsewhere more than once, that Paul spoke in an unskilled fashion because of his ignorance

* * * * *

450 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Cor* PG 124 572A; Zúñiga had maintained that it was a town in Cappadocia.
451 Jerome *Ep* 121 CSEL 56 41
452 2 Cor 11:6
453 Acts 22:3

of Greek? Furthermore, does one who cannot express his thoughts in correct speech not speak somehow less purely and elegantly? And a little further on Jerome shows that Paul used many expressions taken from Cilician idiom,[454] for example, *ἀπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας* [by a human court of judgment][455] meaning 'by human judgment'; and he used the phrase *ἀνθρώπινον λέγω* [I speak human things][456] when he said something rather humble and imperfect; and *οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν* [not pressing heavily on you][457] for one who is threatening another with authority; and *καταβραβεύειν* [cast judgment against],[458] when someone is unfairly depriving a man of his prize in a competition. In Jerome's view Paul used these expressions as Virgil used the expression *sceleratum frigus* [wicked cold].[459] It does not escape me that this is expressed cunningly and cleverly by Jerome, and I am not discussing how much weight his words have with me; I merely indicate that my verdict here was not a rash one. If Paul cannot express his meaning in correct speech, the reason was either his own inexperience, or the language itself not being polished enough, or the matter itself. But he explains the matter in Hebrew, a language in which he was most eloquent; it remains that the Cilician language was rather unpolished or that Paul had little knowledge of it. And Jerome hints that both were the case, for he says both: Paul was inexperienced in the Greek language – not because he could not express himself in a colloquial manner, but because he lacked the pure and elegant speech to make his thoughts clear; and he shows that Paul used certain expressions peculiar to the language of his native people to explain his meaning somehow. Nor does it count against me that Tharsos produced some scholars – Aratus and Oppian[460] – as if Scythia had not also given us Anacharsis.[461] It does not matter where you are born, but who was your teacher. Nor do writers use just any expression found in common speech. For even in the age of Cicero there were certain common expressions from which he himself abstained. And no

* * * * *

454 Jerome *Ep* 121.4–5
455 1 Cor 4:3
456 Rom 6:19
457 See 2 Cor 12:14.
458 Col 2:18
459 Virgil *Georgics* 2.256. Jerome regarded this specific use of *sceleratum* as a feature of the regional dialect of Mantua, Virgil's native city.
460 Aratus of Soli (315–240 BC), poet; Oppian, second-century poet flourishing during the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus
461 Anacharsis, sixth-century AD philosopher; the Scythians were regarded as barbarians.

one, I think, has denied that Paul's mode of expression was common. He could have expressed himself in a more erudite manner, I believe, if he had associated with Demosthenes or Plato or Isocrates at Athens,[462] and he could have expressed his meaning more elegantly.

And after spicing this whole note with numerous insults, Zúñiga adds a fitting conclusion: 'This is Jerome's meaning in the passage which Erasmus cited in his *Annotations* in a stupid and ignorant fashion.' What could I wish for such an idle prater? Just a little more sense, much less talk, somewhat more respect, and much less arrogance.

From chapter 6 [on 1 Cor 6:20]

Empti estis precio magno [you have been redeemed at a high price]: I had noted that the Greek texts do not have 'high' and it would seem to have been 'added in our texts out of the Epistle of Peter.'[463] Zúñiga denies that it was added in our manuscripts and prefers to think that it was added in the Greek texts. And he adduces his 'Athanasius' and Ambrose,[464] who in their exegesis mention a 'high price.' But let him explain to me whether the fact that the exegetes interpreted the price to be high – as indeed it was – means that 'high price' was written in the text? Ambrose certainly cites this passage a few times without adding 'high,' for example in *De Cain et Abel*, book 2, chapter 3,[465] and again in his letters, book 2, chapter 2 and shortly thereafter in chapter 3.[466]

From chapter 7 [on 1 Cor 7:1]

Bonum est homini mulierem non tangere [It is well for a man not to touch a woman]: Since the question was about taking a wife and Paul answered that it would be desirable for Christians to live free and unencumbered by wives, yet because there was the risk of sinful desire, it was better for those who were not temperate to have a wife, I preferred to translate *uxorem* [wife]

* * * * *

462 Demosthenes (384–322 BC) and Isocrates (436–338 BC) were famous orators, the latter a contemporary of the philosopher Plato (b 429 BC).

463 That is, out of 1 Pet 1:18–19. The passage does not contain the word *magno.* Erasmus presumably means that the notion of greatness was taken from that passage.

464 Theophylact (quoted by Zúñiga as 'Athanasius') *Comm in 1 Cor* PG 124 638C; Ambrosiaster (quoted by Zúñiga as 'Ambrose') CSEL 81.2 69–70

465 *De Cain et Abel* 2.3.11 CSEL 32 387, but this concerns 1 Cor 7:23, not 1 Cor 6:20.

466 The reference should read *Ep* 2.7 CSEL 82 45, 50, 66, but these passages as well concern 1 Cor 7:23, not 1 Cor 6:20.

rather than *mulierem* [woman]. For in Greek *γυνή* is an ambiguous word. Here Zúñiga gathers a great deal out of his 'Athanasius,' out of Ambrose, out of Jerome[467] which, if anyone examines the evidence more attentively, is all in my favour and against Zúñiga.[468] Read it and you will find it is so – and I will save myself unproductive work since I am busy enough as it is.

But he adds a fine conclusion. 'If Paul,' he says, 'had meant to speak of a wife, he would have said *καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ γάμου μὴ ἅπτεσθαι*' [it is good for a man not to touch marriage]. For this is how Zúñiga teaches even Paul to speak Greek. As if Paul, when dealing with wives specifically, called them other than *γυναῖκας*.[469] Nor does it escape anyone's notice that in Ambrose *mulier* sometimes means 'wife.'

Ibidem, note 2 [on 1 Cor 7:18]

Circumcisus aliquis … non adducat praeputium [after being circumcised … let him not procure a foreskin]: I certainly translated it more discreetly: *ne asciscat praeputium* [let him not acquire a foreskin]. Zúñiga who is more experienced in these matters than I shows us on the basis of his pseudo-Athanasius[470] that Paul here was thinking of the foreskin which, if missing either by nature or by circumcision so that the *glans* is exposed, can be procured through the skill of a physician. And at the same time he shows that Celsus[471] indicates the remedy for this problem. Granted that what Zúñiga says is correct – if someone obtains something from somewhere which he did not have before, can one not say in Latin *asciscit sibi* [he acquires]? Although it is more plausible in my opinion that Paul speaks of the mind, not of a physical state: if you are circumcised, you must not regret it; if you are not, you need not be dissatisfied with yourself. Origen[472] at any rate in *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* [On the Principles], book 4, thinks that foreskin, once removed, cannot

* * * * *

467 Theophylact (quoted by Zúñiga as 'Athanasius') *Comm in 1 Cor* PG 124 640; Ambrosiaster (quoted by Zúñiga as 'Ambrose') CSEL 81.2 70; Jerome *Adversus Jovinianum* 1.7 PL 23 229

468 That assertion is questionable. In fact, Jerome (see preceding note) specifically says: Paul 'does not say "it is good not to have a wife," but … "not to touch a woman."'

469 Ie the word *γυνή* may denote either 'woman' or 'wife.' See Eph 5:22–4, Col 3:18–19, 1 Tim 2:9–15.

470 That is, Theophylact *Comm in 1 Cor* PG 124 648

471 Cornelius Celsus (26 BC–50 AD) *De medicina* 7.25

472 Origen *De principiis* 4.3.3

possibly be restored. Jerome[473] in *Adversus Jovinianum* [Against Jovinianus], book I, was under the same misconception.

From chapter 9 [on 1 Cor 9:12]

Si alii potestatis vestrae [if others are partakers of this power over you]: Here I noted that Greek *ἐξουσία* (Latin: *potestas* [power]) must be interpreted, not in the sense of just any kind of right, but the right to share in the harvest and to bring along wives, a right they conceded to the other apostles. Here Zúñiga criticizes me on two counts: firstly, because I agree with Lorenzo[474] who believes that Paul here speaks of the wives of the apostles, and secondly because I apply to the apostles what was said about the false apostles.

Paul's meaning is uncertain. Nor am I unaware how greatly the exegetes shy away from the idea of 'wives,' especially the Latin exegetes. However, it is clear enough that I do not at all subscribe to Lorenzo's view from the fact that a little earlier I refute the reasoning which leads him to conclude that Paul speaks of wives here. For this is how I begin my citation from Lorenzo: 'Lorenzo quibbles regarding this passage: "After having said sister, what point was there in adding woman? As if someone who is not a woman could be a sister."' Thereupon I: 'but he added "sister" so that you may understand "Christian woman."' And why, someone may say, did you a little later mention 'wives? Because I was not concerned about this point and do not think it absurd to apply the passage to wives. Yet I added in the second edition 'wives or women,' as if I had divined that Zúñiga would make his appearance as Momus.[475] Would it have been a crime, if I had held the opinion that the apostles had wives when Clement[476] was of this opinion, attributing wives to Peter and Philip and adducing this very passage, which is the basis of their teaching that Paul had a wife? Let Zúñiga call me an idle prattler, if he does not find this in the *History of the Church*, book III,[477] which Eusebius put together.

Furthermore, I won't discuss at present whether he said this about the false apostles or about the true apostles. A little earlier[478] at any rate he

* * * * *

473 Jerome *Adversus Jovinianum* 1.11 PL 23 235B
474 Lorenzo Valla in a note on 1 Cor 9:5
475 In Greek mythology the god Momus personified mocking, fault-finding, and sharp criticism. See *Adagia* I v 74.
476 Clement of Alexandria (150–215 AD), theologian and philosopher, cited in Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.30
477 See preceding note.
478 1 Cor 9:5

expressly mentioned 'Cephas and the brothers of the Lord.' However this may be, even false apostles can be called 'apostles,' so that no one is compelled to apply it to the true apostles on my authority and against his own will. And this is the famous passage which in his marginal summary he criticizes as 'incorrectly expounded.'

From chapter 10 [on 1 Cor 10:4]

Bibebant autem de spirituali etc. [But they drank from the spiritual drink … from the rock that accompanied them]: Here I had noted the precise meaning of the Greek word *ἀκολουθείσης*, which denotes a constant companion on a journey. For something may 'follow,' even at a great distance. Here Zúñiga gathers together a great heap of evidence to show that that rock which was in the desert Sin did not travel with the Jews across the desert but supplied water to them on their way. He cites a great deal out of the history of the Old Testament and much out of his 'Athanasius,'[479] none of which argues against me. Indeed Paul is speaking of Christ, whom that rock denotes. He was never far away from his people.

But Zúñiga has this peculiar trait that, whenever he comes across something in his reading and would like to mention it, he looks for an opportunity to insert it. But he could have given us his lesson and even the proof, if he so pleased, without doing injury to anyone. Here at any rate he had no business to tangle with me, since I neither disagree with him nor state anything objectionable.

From chapter 12 [on 1 Cor 12:28]

Interpretationes sermonum [interpretations of words]: I indicated that this phrase is not found in the Greek manuscripts, although it is in the Latin ones. Hence I suspect that it was added in ours, especially since the phrase is not even mentioned by the Greek exegetes. It resembles an earlier passage in which we read 'to another the interpretation of words,'[480] and the Greeks read 'interpretation of tongues' (although I do not find the phrase in the Greek manuscript of Theophylact). Nevertheless he[481] makes a distinction between 'kinds of tongues' and 'interpretation of tongues'; and a little later he repeats this, making the same distinction: 'Do all speak in tongues then? Do all interpret?' From this Zúñiga concludes that what is missing in contemporary

* * * * *

479 That is, Theophylact *Comm in 1 Cor* PG 124 680C
480 1 Cor 12:10
481 That is, Paul. Here Erasmus is paraphrasing Zúñiga's objection.

texts was written in the old Greek manuscripts. But since Zúñiga has superb manuscripts, especially that Rhodian which he values so highly,[482] let him document the phrase, if he can, and I shall add what is missing. It could be that a Latin scholar, seeing that the section in the middle did not correspond to the preceding and the following passage, added what he suspected was missing. But since such problems are frequent in Holy Writ, it would have been preferable to ask what was Paul's purpose in not adding it. As far as I am concerned, I did my duty, indicating what was missing in the Greek texts and adding my conjecture without doing injury to anyone. I did not undertake to add of my own what is missing in the Greek texts.

In some very old manuscripts, which the College of St Donatian at Bruges[483] recently put at my disposal, the phrase, which I say is missing in the Greek texts, is not added. [I mention this] in case someone thinks what I am proffering is a dream of mine.

From chapter 14 [on 1 Cor 14:21]

In lege enim scriptum est etc. [For it is written in the law, etc]: The passage in Isaiah, chapter 28,[484] was cited as 'chapter 22,' which no doubt happened through the negligence of the typesetters and proofreaders. But this is the type of mistake that is not easy to detect by proofreading, unless one checks the proofs against the copy. Even Zúñiga can see that this is the truth, for I substituted the correct number in the second edition. Yet, as if a terrible crime had been committed, the marginal note reads 'Erasmus clearly hallucinates' and in the text we read 'Erasmus raved.' I prefer a hundred times being at fault in remembering the chapter number (but how could I have made a mistake, when I copied what I wrote at that time from a manuscript?) than being at fault in my speech in the way Zúñiga is everywhere – speaking ill of his brother for whatever trivial reason.

As for Paul adding 'says the Lord,' a phrase which is not in Isaiah, I note that it was added to give it the full ring of a prophecy, meaning of course that it was established practice to corroborate prophecies by adding the phrase 'says the Lord.' Zúñiga, who misunderstood this, castigates my inexperience and carelessness, showing that the phrase 'and neither will they hear me thus' follows a little later in the same chapter.[485] Why then, he says,

* * * * *

482 The remark is sarcastic. For the 'Rhodian' manuscript see n331 above.
483 See n406 above.
484 Isa 28:11–12
485 That is, at the end of verse 12

have you added that phrase? To indicate that it belongs with 'says the Lord.' Nor do I affirm that the passage was 'taken from elsewhere'; rather, I express doubt, using the words 'unless perhaps,' adding my reason, namely that 'Jerome[486] himself does not affirm it, but says that he thinks it was taken from this passage in Isaiah.'

From chapter 16 [on 1 Cor 16:8]

Permanebo autem Ephesi [I, however, shall remain in Ephesus]: Since I found *ἐπιμένω* [present tense] in my manuscripts, I translated 'I remain.' After obtaining other manuscripts I put 'I shall remain' in the second edition. Which [tense] you read makes no difference whatsoever. But [Zúñiga says], I made many mistakes in this passage, and this is one of them. Another is my conjecture that *pentecosten* here does not denote the Jewish feast day, since Paul was already condemning their feast days, but 'the fiftieth day.'[487] Theophylact (who is Zúñiga's 'Athanasius') expresses himself in this sense as well.[488] For I think it is insipid to believe with Bede[489] in [his commentary on] Acts that Easter and Pentecost were celebrated by the Christians even in the time of the apostles. They did celebrate, but daily. Zúñiga explores many angles to prove that Paul meant the feast day, and I am not displeased with the man's diligent explanation of this passage. Nor do I insist – to the point of excluding any other opinion – that Paul did not mean the feast day; for I believe that this is one of those passages which allows each reader to indulge in his own interpretation.

From 2 Corinthians, chapter 1 [on 2 Cor 1:6]

Sive consolamur pro vestra [or it is for your consolation]: In the text of the first edition the printers made two mistakes. *Εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα* was translated *sive consolationem accipitis* [if you accept consolation] instead of *accipimus* [we accept]; and *ὑμῶν*, 'your' as 'our.' If this had been done on purpose, I would have pointed it out in the annotation. But since I say not a word and corrected it in the second edition, the facts themselves declare that it happened by mistake. Zúñiga will say: 'It was your task to see that no mistake is

* * * * *

486 Jerome *Comm in Isa* PL 24 331B

487 The literal meaning of Pentecost

488 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Cor* PG 124 788, but Erasmus' claim that Theophylact 'interprets it in this sense' is not cogent.

489 Erasmus took this testimony from the *Glossa Ordinaria* on Acts 20:16. There is no evidence that Christians celebrated Pentecost before the third or fourth century.

made in a sacred work.' That's all very well for Zúñiga to say, and I wish it were possible. But I shall never succeed in this with the typesetters, even if I burst. The rest of Zúñiga's discussion does not concern me.

Ibidem note 2 [on 2 Cor 1:24]

Non quia dominamur fidei vestrae [not because we have dominion over your faith]: Since the Greek phrase is *κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως* rather than *κυριεύομεν τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως*, I ask the reader to consider whether 'have dominion on account of faith' is a possible meaning, that is, Paul would not have had dominion over them if they had not believed. What crime was it to point this out when this meaning is contained in the Greek words and fits the context well? But, says Zúñiga, 'this form of speech is rarely or never found in the apostles.' Even if it were never found in the apostles, the fact that it is rather frequently found in Greek is enough for me to put forth a conjecture. He says I should not have been troubled by the position of the article for there are other places as well where the article is transposed in similar fashion. Let him cite the passage[490] where this is done and I shall put my doubts to rest. As for the remainder, one can hardly make out the meaning from the Latin version of Theophylact. Later, when I obtained a copy of the book in Greek,[491] I saw that he interpreted the phrase to mean: Another man's faith is not in our power, for no one can be forced to believe. But the article tells against this interpretation.

From chapter 2 [on 2 Cor 2:3]

Ut non cum venero tristiciam, etc [that, when I come, I may not be saddened]: I had indicated that the phrase *super tristiciam* is not added in the Greek manuscripts, but was added here from another Pauline passage by some zealous person, that is, from the Epistle to the Philippians, chapter 2[492] – especially since it is not added by either Ambrose or Theophylact.[493] Zúñiga attests that it was added in a certain Rhodian manuscript.[494] But I set against that Rhodian so many old manuscripts which I have seen, some

* * * * *

490 Zúñiga was right and could have cited, eg Rom 14:16, 1 Cor 9:11, or 2 Cor 10:6.
491 Theophylact PG 124 813D
492 Ie Phil 2:27
493 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 205; Theophylact PG 124 816C
494 See n331 above.

in England, others in Brabant and in Basel. Some Cardinal[495] had brought several of these manuscripts from Rome to Basel when the council was held there, and when he died during his sojourn, he left his whole library, which consisted of Greek books, to the Carthusian monastery.[496] And I found that some Greek manuscripts have been corrected after ours,[497] of which I suspect that Rhodian is one. If this is so, that book is nothing but a white line on a white stone.[498] I would rather put my trust in a Greek manuscript that does not agree in everything with ours.

From chapter 4 [on 2 Cor 4:8]

Aporiamur, sed non destituimur [we are afflicted but we are not crushed]: I beg you, dear reader, to consider Zúñiga's impudence in discussing this passage. Since *aporiamur* is a word unheard of in Latin,[499] I had translated *laboramus*. In my *Annotations* I diligently explained the nature of the Greek word which means 'to be stuck, perplexed, helpless.' I add that the same word sometimes denotes one in need, not of counsel, but of the necessities of life, and for this reason Ambrose[500] translated the word in this passage 'needy.' Although Zúñiga gave the same explanation in his note in a somewhat inferior manner, he makes no mention at all of my note, so that what he cites out of his 'Athanasius'[501] and out of Hesychius[502] would appear a new contribution. And in his marginal summary he writes: 'Erasmus did not understand the meaning of the verb *aporiare*.' And in this matter I strongly disagree with Zúñiga, for in his opinion the verb *aporiare* has two meanings, 'to be in doubt' and 'to be in need'; in my opinion it has neither meaning, in fact it has no meaning at all.[503]

* * * * *

495 Johann Stojkovic of Ragusa (c 1390–1443) took part in the Council of Basel (1431–49) and was sent by the council on a mission to Constantinople (1435–7). He was created cardinal by the schismatic pope Felix V in 1440 and died in Lausanne in 1443.

496 A slip for 'Dominican monastery'

497 An unfounded theory of Erasmus; He believed that the Greek text had been adapted as a result of a decree of the Ecumenical Council of Ferrara and Florence (1438–45), whose object was the reunion of the Latin and Greek churches.

498 *Adagia* I v 88

499 That is, in classical Latin. It is used only by Christian writers.

500 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 224

501 That is, Theophylact *Comm in 2 Cor* PG 124 841

502 Zúñiga had quoted the entry *aporei* from Hesychius' lexicon.

503 It has 'no meaning' in the sense that it was not classical and meant nothing to readers or writers of classical Latin.

I know of course that Zúñiga will deny that the summaries are his work,[504] and relying on this excuse he is all the more virulent, for if there is anything in the summaries that is indefensible, he can simply dissociate himself from it.

Perhaps he will say: 'You do not translate according to your interpretation, for you translate *laboramus*.' As if *laborare* in Latin did not denote those who are anxious and in two minds, especially when in a dangerous situation.

From chapter 6 [on 2 Cor 6:16]

Et inambulabo inter eos [and I shall walk among them]: My note runs 'There is no equivalent for *inter eos* in the Greek text, yet the Translator tried to express the meaning of the verb *ἐμπεριπατήσω*, which means "to walk around in."' Here Zúñiga, having nothing to criticize, compares the passage with Hebrew, with the Septuagint translation, and with Jerome. How is this relevant to me? Yet he writes in his marginal summary: 'The Translator rendered this passage correctly,' so that the reader who does not pay close attention will suspect that I criticized the Translator, when this is not the case at all.

From chapter 10 [on 2 Cor 10:7]

Quae secundum faciem sunt videte [see the face value]: Since the Greek word *βλέπετε* [see] can be either indicative or imperative,[505] I explain that the intonation varies accordingly. Some prefer to make it a question because it makes for sharper criticism – in that case one must read 'do you see?' I took what I said out of the Greek scholia,[506] which cite Theodoretus[507] as the author of this view. No firm conclusion can be drawn from what Zúñiga cites out of the Latin translation of his 'Athanasius.'[508] Indeed, it seems more likely that he agreed with Theodoretus. For since he explains that Paul not only threatened those who deceived others, but also reproached those who let themselves be deceived, saying *κρίνετε*, that is, judge on the basis of what you see whether someone is vainglorious, rich, or creating the appearance of virtue. How can this meaning agree with reading 'you see'? Let Zúñiga go

* * * * *

504 Marginal notes or summaries were often added by the publisher or typesetters.
505 This is still a matter of discussion today.
506 An anonymous commentary ascribed to Oecumenius, bishop of Trikka in Thessaly, who flourished at the end of the tenth century PG 118 1032C
507 Theodoretus (393–457), Byzantine theologian, PG 82 436B
508 That is, Theophylact *Comm in 2 Cor* PG 124 904A

now and write in his marginal summary with his customary impudence: 'A manifest hallucination of Erasmus.'

From chapter 11 [on 2 Cor 11:1]

Sed et supportate me [But you must suffer me]: In Greek *ἀνέχεσθε* means either 'suffer!' or 'you suffer.' I prefer the indicative mood, and in my annotation I indicate that this was the reading of the Greek scholia.[509] If Zúñiga wants to inspect them, let him obtain them from the Dominican monastery at Basel. It is a neat old copy, left by the Cardinal I mentioned.[510] Zúñiga contradicts me and shows that the other meaning is possible as well. Even if he can prove this, he does not prove what he announced in his marginal summary: 'Incorrectly translated by Erasmus.' Indeed, as proof that I translated incorrectly, he proffers nothing but pure dreams. For what he adduces out of the Latin translation of Theophylact is a white line on a white stone.[511] Indeed if one examines this more attentively, [one can see that] Theophylact read *ἀνέχεσθε* in the indicative since he adds: 'I trust that in future you will treat me with good will.' For we say someone does something when we trust that he will do it. Later, when I obtained access to the Greek text,[512] I found *ἀνέχεσθε* in the commentary. I beseech you, dear reader, who is patient enough to bear this man's impudence, who is under the impression that he is writing, not for men, but for blockheads?

Ibidem, note 2 [on 2 Cor 11:2]

Despondi enim vos uni viro [for I have betrothed you to one husband]: I translated *ἡρμοσάμην* by *adiunxi* [I joined] rather than *despondi* [I betrothed], reasoning that one who betroths does not by the same token join in marriage, and in Greek a special term is used for betrothing: *μνηστεύειν*. Here Zúñiga explains that in Greek *ἡρμοσάμην* is often used for betrothing, but fails to give a single example, and even if he could give an example it would not tell against me, for whoever 'joins' the betrothed woman, does in fact join the two parties together.

* * * * *

509 Scholia attributed to Oecumenius, PG 118 1041A

510 See n495 above.

511 Erasmus means that that Latin translator of Theophylact had been influenced by the Vulgate text. Thus his reading did not prove anything. Erasmus had used the proverbial expression 'a white line on a white stone' earlier. See n498 above.

512 PG 124 908C

It is really ridiculous that he adduces his 'Athanasius' in the Latin translation.[513] Undoubtedly, he read *ἡρμοσάμην*, and the Latin translator, following the Vulgate, rendered it by *despondi*. What a master of logic!

As for Theophylactus/Athanasius[514] adding 'for I shall not be the groom myself but the groomsman [*sponsae ductor*]' and soon afterwards 'he even put them in the bride's place and himself in the groomsman's [*pronubae*] who is about to join the parties in marriage' – from these words, however poorly translated, it is obvious that Theophylact tells against Zúñiga. For a *νυμφόστολος*[515] does not betroth, but leads the betrothed from the parents' home to join her with the groom. Nor does a *pronuba* betroth – rather he hands the bride over to the groom. And this is the man who accuses me of understanding nothing at all in sacred authors. His insults bother me very little, but I fear that such ugly and scurrilous squabbles will alienate many from sacred studies.

Ibidem, note 3 [on 2 Cor 11:32]

Damasci praepositus [the commander of Damascus]: In my annotation I indicated that Aretas was the father-in-law of Herod. Zúñiga is critical because I failed to explain who this Herod was when there are several of his name.[516] If this is a fault, I am at fault everywhere. For there is no passage to which one could not add something.

From the Epistle to the Galatians [on Gal 1:16]

Continuo non acquievi carni etc [immediately, I refrained from consulting a human being]: I indicated, following Jerome,[517] that Stephen's narrative[518] here appears 'to differ in many ways from that which is found in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 9.' I add that it is not my task in this work to pursue this at length, so that the reader, if he needs more information, may consult Jerome. Zúñiga comments: 'Paul's narrative here does not – as Erasmus told us – appear to differ very much from that which is given by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 9. Rather it appears to explain the other passage or to elaborate on it, so to speak, even though at first glance it appears to be

* * * * *

513 See n426 above.
514 That is, Theophylact *Comm in 2 Cor* PG 125 908D
515 Actually, Theophylact has *νυμφαγωγός*.
516 It was Herodes Antipas.
517 Jerome *Comm in Gal* PL 26 352–3 discusses the discrepancies.
518 Erasmus means 'Paul's narrative,' as he had written in his annotation.

different from it.' What do I hear? What appears to be the case, does not appear to be so? Does what appears to be the case at first glance not appear to be the case? If it does not appear to be the case, what Jerome said is wrong. Furthermore, when I said 'differ' I meant in form, not in matter. The rest of Zúñiga's discussion does not pertain to me.

From chapter 3 [on Gal 3:1]

O insensati Galatae, quis vos fascinavit? [O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you?]: Because most Latin manuscripts had the same words in chapter 5 of this Epistle, I added in passing these words to my annotation: 'In *Adversus Jovinianum* [Against Jovinianus], Book 2,[519] Jerome uses the translation *impedivit* [has hindered],' for I suspected that that passage too had the Greek word *ἐβάσκηνεν* [bewitched], whereas it has *ἐνέκοψεν* [hindered]. This was the sum of my crime, dear reader. Here one could blame me for not examining the Greek text attentively enough in the hurry and confusion, but Zúñiga in his marginal summary blames me for 'not having understood Jerome.' Furthermore, even the *Ordinary Gloss* itself shows that the Latin texts had an alternative reading in chapter 5; so does a wonderfully ancient manuscript in the College of St Donatian at Bruges.[520]

Ibidem, note 2 [on Gal 3:8]

Praevidens autem Deus [God, however, foreseeing]: I wrote that in Homer a reward, that is, *evangelium* [a reward for good news], is promised by Penelope to Ulysses. Zúñiga says that Ulysses demanded a reward for the good news from Eumaeus.[521] Granted that my memory was faulty and I did not check the passage (although what I say may also be true),[522] what happened to me with regard to Homer was no different from what happened to Cicero according to Aulus Gellius, Book 15, chapter 6.[523] He transferred to Ajax the verses which in Homer are spoken by Hector; nor does Gellius express surprise at this lapse of memory in so great a man. Now listen to Zúñiga's spiteful words: 'as dreamed up by Erasmus, steeped in butter and homebrew.'

* * * * *

519 Jerome *Adversus Jovinianum* 2.3 PL 23 298B

520 For the *Ordinary Gloss*, see n76 above. For the manuscript Erasmus used in Bruges, see n407 above.

521 Zúñiga is correct. See Homer *Odyssey* 14.152.

522 At Homer *Odyssey* 19.310, Penelope promises a reward to Ulysses, but the word used there is not *evangelia* but *dora*, the general word for presents.

523 Gellius *Attic Nights* 15.6

From chapter 4 [on Gal 4:20]

Quoniam confundor in vobis [because I am confused about you]: I had noted that Jerome[524] was of the opinion that there was no difference between *αἰσχύνη* and *σύνχυσις* because in this passage he discusses two words denoting the same thing, [that is, confusion], using *αἰσχύνη* and *σύνχυσις* as examples. Zúñiga explains that in the Venetian edition,[525] which had come out prior to the Basel edition,[526] the space in which *σύνχυσις* appears now was left blank, and he suspects that the blank space should be filled with *ἐντροπήν* rather than *σύνχυσιν*.[527] Granted that what Zúñiga says is plausible, how dare he impute to me what appears in another book? And Zúñiga acts as if the Amerbachs had no other text but that given in the Venetian edition, whereas they used very old manuscripts requested from some monastery,[528] in which they put all the more trust because the copyist was ignorant. For none introduce more and more dangerous, corruptions into books than half-taught men or even learned men who do not pay enough attention. If it is wrong to translate the Greek as *confundi* [be confused] rather than *erubescere* [blush], and if Jerome does not use these words in the same manner, Zúñiga has grounds for refuting me. What does that amount to but looking for a knot in a reed?[529]

From chapter 6 [on Gal 6:2]

Alter alterius onera portate [carry one another's burdens]: Here my friend Zúñiga puts into the marginal summary: 'Erasmus translated this passage

* * * * *

524 Jerome *Comm in Gal* PL 26 413

525 That is, the edition of Jerome, published in Venice, 1497. Zúñiga's observation is correct.

526 The 9-volume Basel edition of Jerome was published in 1516. The first four volumes, comprising the letters of Jerome, were edited by Erasmus. See n27 above.

527 This is still an open question. The passage in PL 26 413 has *αἰσχύνη sive σύνχυσις*.

528 The preparatory work of gathering manuscripts had been done by the printer Johann Amerbach, who died in 1513. His sons carried on his work. See Ep 396:288–97: 'By comparing many copies, early copies especially, and sometimes adding my conjectures as the traces of the script suggested, I have removed the blunders and restored the correct reading … What I was less able to manage by myself I have achieved with the assistance of others, and especially of the brothers Amerbach, Bruno, Basilius, and Bonifacius, whom their excellent father Johannes Amerbach equipped with the three tongues as though they were born expressly for the revival of ancient texts.'

529 That is, looking for difficulties where there are none. The expression is proverbial. See *Adagia* II iv 76.

incorrectly from the Greek,' whereas I made no change in the translation except that I put 'carry your burden mutually' [*invicem*] instead of 'carry one another's [*alter alterius*] burden.' However, this is not the point of Zúñiga's criticism. He merely disapproves of my admonition in the annotation: '*ἀναπληρώσατε* means *redimplete* [fill up] rather than *implete* [fill].'[530] I was not thinking of repetitive action, however, but of relative action, for *reconcinnatur* does not mean 'restored again' but rather 'restored to its original state' when something was torn or ripped up; *redditur* does not mean 'returned again' but 'returned to him from whom it was taken'; and *recipitur* does not mean 'received again' but 'received from another.' I explained this in very clear terms in my first edition, writing as follows: 'as if he said that what was detracted from the observance of the law by one person's wrongdoing is made good by the charity of others.' Here, too, Zúñiga is true to himself, for when I said 'observance of the law,' he interprets law to mean 'evangelical law,' whereas Jerome,[531] whom (according to Zúñiga) I read in a hurry and did not understand, referred to the Mosaic law. How does Zúñiga arrive at this conjecture? Even if this had been my meaning, what crime would it have been, when Jerome in the passage which Zúñiga accuses me of misunderstanding, reports two meanings: firstly, if someone is not yet a perfect Christian, the stronger man should accommodate himself to the weaker out of love and charity, so that the latter might make progress; secondly, let Christian charity come to the aid of one who is not yet strong enough to despise the Mosaic law, and bear with the weak man until he makes progress. Zúñiga slanders me without reason – where is his proud assertion now?

As for the rest of what he cites out of his badly translated Latin 'Athanasius,'[532] I'll leave it be and regard it as an addition to the bulk of his volume, since it proves nothing and does not tell against me.

I explained what the prefix *re* means in Latin. Let Zúñiga be the golden boy and myself a blockhead[533] if *ἀνὰ-* can never be translated into Latin by *re-*, when *ἀναφορά* means *relatio*, *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις recapitulatio*, and *ἀνάλυσις resolutio*.

* * * * *

530 The verse continues 'and you will fulfil [*ἀναπληρώσατ*] the law of Christ.'

531 Jerome *Comm in Gal* PL 26 455D–456B

532 That is, a Latin translation of Theophylact PG 124 1024A

533 A reference to golden and wooden statues being awarded in competitions. See *Adagia* I viii 14.

From the Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 1 [on Eph 1:4]

Ut essemus sancti et immaculati [to be holy and blameless]: *Immaculati* [blameless] translates Greek *ἀμώμους*; I translated it *irreprehensibiles*. Nevertheless, I do not condemn the Translator's version. If *μῶμος* in Greek simply means 'blemish,' I ask you, why in heaven do they call that infamous critic Momus?[534] Or what was on the mind of the Greek craftsman who inscribed this line on his works: *μωμήσεται τις θᾶσσον ἢ μιμήσεται* [it is easier to criticize than to imitate].[535] I do not deny that *macula* [blemish] can be used for *reprehensio* [blame] or *vicium* [a failing] that is open to criticism. But is not my note correct nevertheless?[536] Indeed failings, both physical and spiritual, are *maculae*, if you allow a metaphor. But Zúñiga collects some passages from Holy Writ in which *ἄμωμοι* is translated by *immaculati*. Who denies it? In fact, who does not know this? And it is generosity indeed to bring even Hebrew passages[537] into the line-up of witnesses.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Eph 1:21]

Et virtutem et dominationem [both virtue and domination]: Instead of *dominatio*, which is *κυριότης* in Greek, I translated *dominium*, my train of thought being that *dominium* more clearly expresses the meaning of the Greek word, which has the connotation of 'owner's rights.' For *dominatio* may refer to a tyrannical rule. Zúñiga believes that the two words have the same meaning and is indignant that I changed the original one, which has already been accepted as a term for an order of angels.[538] I for my part do not think that the orders of angels are so captious that, when among the pagans Bacchus is addressed by so many epithets,[539] they would take it badly if one spoke of their *dominium* instead of *dominatio*.

* * * * *

534 For Momus see n475 above.

535 Plutarch (*De gloria Atheniensium* 2) tells this story of the fifth-century painter Apollodorus; Pliny *Naturalis historia* 35.36.63 tells the same story of the painter Zeuxis, who flourished around 400 BC.

536 In his annotation on this passage Erasmus had written: '*ἀμώμος* means blameless or irreprehensible rather than faultless. For in Greek *μῶμος* means reprehension, as in "the God of reprehension."' But his main point was that *immaculatus*, the word used in the Vulgate, is not found in classical writers.

537 Zúñiga cited, for example, Ps 118.

538 This is another case in which Zúñiga accepts ecclesiastical Latin, whereas Erasmus prefers classical usage.

539 Bacchus, the God of wine, is called Dionysus, Liber, Bromius, Lenaeus, etc. in classical literature.

From chapter 2 [on Eph 2:14–15]

Et medium parietem maceriae [and the barrier between us]: I had translated the Greek phrase *μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ* by *interstitium maceriae* [intervening wall]. What troubled me was the fact that, since *maceria* means 'wall,' it appears to be awkward to say 'the middle wall of the wall.' For Paul is thinking of a wall separating two buildings. Here, according to my friend Zúñiga, I am raving on several counts, and being a comic, he is not far from bursting with laughter.[540]

'Properly speaking,' he says, '*μεσότοιχον* means "the middle wall."' No, properly speaking, it is *μεσοτοιχία*, that is, the barrier wall or the separating wall.

Then he reprehends me because I translated *ἔχθραν* [hostility] by *simultatem* rather than *inimicitiam*; my train of thought was that *simultas* has the connotation of both parties being annoyed, that is, there is mutual ill will. For *inimicitia* can exist where there is no mutual hatred. What, then, gives offense to Zúñiga here? 'Among the theologians,' he says, 'of whom Erasmus boasts to be one, *simultas* is usually accepted in another sense.'[541] Where do I boast of being one of the theologians?[542] Rather, Zúñiga reveals that he is not one of the competent theologians, although I would prefer to assume that some buffoon interjected nonsense of this kind into the writings of Zúñiga, that admirable gentleman, who according to his preface came to the subject equipped with so many excellent and heroic qualities. And even so, I fail to understand why *simultas* has a different connotation for theologians than for us.

But let this pass for a joke – I was clearly 'raving' when I noted in one or two words that the Greeks punctuate the clauses in such a manner that 'enmity' goes with the following verb 'abolishing' which I translated as *abrogans*, and on consulting the Greek text I saw clearly that this was Theophylact's

* * * * *

540 In his note *ad locum* Zúñiga had written: 'I tend to dissolve in laughter whenever I come across this kind of nicety in Erasmus.'

541 In classical Latin *simultas* means 'enmity'; scholastic theologians used the word in the sense of 'simultaneity.'

542 Not in the *Annotations*, where he tries to fend off the criticism of theologians by declaring that he performed merely the task of a grammarian: 'If someone says I'm not a theologian, then I played the part of a grammarian' (CWE 41 862). In his letters, however, he does occasionally claim the title of theologian (eg Epp 393:71–2, 1581:22).

reading.[543] Here Zúñiga casts into my teeth his pseudonymous Athanasius,[544] whom (he says) 'Erasmus himself will acknowledge as a Greek Doctor' [of the church]. I acknowledge Theophylact as well, nor do I deny that he is a Greek Doctor [of the church], but I note that his work was read by Zúñiga, not in Greek, but in a rather bad Latin version. Thus Zúñiga does not achieve much with his evidence. Even if Athanasius had meant exactly what Zúñiga says in his interpretation, what crime was there in pointing out the interpretation in the Greek scholia,[545] when both alternatives are acceptable?

But listen to Zúñiga's eloquent slander. One crime remains: that I added in my *Annotations*: 'A text cited by Jerome has *in dogmatibus*.' This he calls an error 'of the same stamp.' 'Indeed,' he says, 'Jerome cites no text; and that old text of the Apostolic Epistles on which he comments has *in dogmatibus*.'[546] What do I hear? Does he not 'cite' what he adduces out of that text? Or can that particular text not be called 'a' text, since it differs from the text we are using? [547] Which was the text corrected by Jerome – that old one or the text we have now? Which would Zúñiga rather have? He cannot mean that old one, since Jerome criticizes a great deal in it, even things that concern the meaning. Nor can he mean ours, because ours has the very reading he criticizes. It follows therefore that neither was corrected by Jerome. Since then it was one of many texts, what keeps me from saying 'a' text?

Ibidem, note 2 [on Eph 2:19]

Sed estis cives [but you are citizens]: Since it is *συμπολῖται* in Greek, I translated *concives* [fellow-citizens]. Here Zúñiga almost turns to stone with shock because, whereas otherwise I am rather concerned with purity, I

* * * * *

543 Erasmus may have found this punctuation in one of the manuscripts he consulted. It does not appear in the Basel manuscript of Theophylact or in the edition of Theophylact in PG 124 1060–1.

544 See n258 above.

545 Erasmus generally uses the term 'Greek scholia' to refer to the commentary of Pseudo-Oecumenius in one of the manuscripts (AN III.11) which he used. But in this case the commentary does not support him. He may have misremembered his source.

546 Jerome *Comm in Eph* PL 26 504A. Zúñiga has a point. Although Jerome uses *dogmatibus* in his commentary, it is not necessarily a quotation from the text he used.

547 The implication that there was more than one version of the biblical text in Jerome's time irritated Zúñiga. The myth of a master text without variants was embraced by many theologians. Erasmus had a better and more realistic grasp of the manuscript tradition than most of his contemporaries.

adopted here a word quite foreign to the Latin tongue. Elsewhere he derides me for demanding such petty observances from the Translator. I shall not reply to Zúñiga, although I could say a great deal. His business is not with me, but with Valla.[548] Yet at the end of his wonderful little note, he suddenly turns quite polite. 'At least,' he says, 'as far as I can remember, I have never read *concivem* in Cicero.' Then why does he state earlier on that it is a word 'quite foreign to the Latin tongue'? [549]

From chapter 3 [on Eph 3:15]

Ex quo omnis paternitas [from whom every family]: Because *paternitas* is meaningless in Latin,[550] and if it signifies anything, it is not what Paul means here, I used the translation *parentela*, a word which Jerome[551] attests was commonly used in his age to denote kinship going back to the same forefather. I preferred this word to *paternitas* which is awkward on two counts and an intolerably barbarous expression as well. For here at any rate the analogy is meaningful: just as *clientela* is derived from *cliens*, so *parentela* is derived from *parens*. If I had translated *familia*, the figure of *προσονομασία*[552] would have been lost, and with it the force of Paul's words.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Eph 3:19]

Scire supereminentem scientiae charitatem [to experience love which surpasses knowledge]: I had indicated that the phrase was ambiguous in Latin, for it was uncertain whether *scientiae* was dative or genitive. If it is a dative case the meaning will be: the charity of God is greater than can be comprehended by human understanding. If it is a genitive, the sense is: Christ's love of knowledge is extraordinary. What I said is correct, and Ambrose[553] adopts the first meaning. If anyone doubts it, let him read his commentaries,

* * * * *

548 Valla had argued for *concives* in his *Elegantiae* (*Opera omnia*, Turin 1962, I 149–50). Normally it was Erasmus who argued in favour of classical usage and is criticized by Zúñiga for his attention to grammatical niceties.

549 Ie while Cicero is considered the arbiter of classical usage, Zúñiga should have argued that no classical writer used it.

550 It is 'meaningless' in the sense that it does not occur in classical Latin.

551 Jerome *Adversus Helvidium* PL 23 207B, but Erasmus has misunderstood Jerome, and Zúñiga was right in saying in his note *ad locum* that *parentela* is not documented in classical Latin. Erasmus tacitly corrected his mistake and changed his translation in later editions.

552 Erasmus regularly uses this term to denote paronomasia, a play on words with a similar sound.

553 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81.3.93–4

although in the text he follows a different reading – different from both the Greek and our Latin. For he reads thus: *cognoscere quoque supereminentem scientiam charitatis Christi* [to experience also the surpassing knowledge of Christ's love]. What then is Zúñiga's complaint? 'You translate *praeeminentem cognitioni*,' he says, 'and prefer your interpretation to that of Jerome's.'[554] But my interpretation is also Ambrose's. Nor is there anything in Jerome's commentaries that contradicts my interpretation. In fact, he says almost the same as I, for at the end he explains that something must be added to 'knowledge,' namely 'love.' And would it be a novel thing that Greek *ὑπερβάλλω* may be joined with a genitive, just like *ὑπερασπίζω* and *ὑπερλογοῦμαι*? I do not want to take refuge in the argument (although I could) that Paul used the [wrong] case of the noun because he either did not know or did not care about the Greek idiom.

The Greek text of Theophylact[555] was not at hand when I wrote this, but either the translator did not render the Greek very faithfully, or the author had a different reading from ours, or he thought that the genitive rightly belonged with the participle *ὑπερβάλλουσαν*.

The meaning expressed by the Latin phrase is certainly problematic, and I see that the interpreters are perplexed and at a loss how to explain it. Yet I put *cognitionis* instead of *cognitioni* in the third edition. You see, dear reader, that I am not as ignorant of Greek as Zúñiga thinks, nor endowed with such 'singular impudence' as he makes me out to be.[556]

Afterwards I discovered in the Greek Theophylact[557] that he interprets: Christ's charity surpasses human understanding.

From chapter 4 [on Eph 4:27]

Nolite locum dare diabolo [Do not give an opportunity to the devil]: I advise the reader to consider whether one might translate 'slanderer' instead of 'devil,' for it is *διάβολος* in Greek.[558] But, [you might say], the exegetes interpret it as referring to Satan. This has not escaped me, but why should the other meaning be rejected when it has nothing absurd in it? And seeing that Satan, as they call him in Hebrew, is called 'slanderer' in Greek, will it not

* * * * *

554 Jerome *Comm in Eph* PL 26 523B
555 That is, the Greek manuscript in the Dominican monastery in Basel. See n122 above.
556 In his note *ad locum* Zúñiga had written: 'Oh, the man's singular impudence!'
557 Theophylact PG 124 1077–8
558 'Slanderer' is the general meaning of Greek *διάβολος*, but in the Bible the word exclusively denotes Satan.

be permitted to call a man a slanderer? And seeing that the Hebrews call a demon who is hostile to man's welfare 'Satan,' are they not permitted to call a man 'Satan,' when Christ calls Peter 'Satan'?[559]

But let us assume that 'slanderer' cannot possibly be applied to a human being – is it not permissible to call *διάβολος* in Latin 'slanderer'? Many now call a demon *diabolus* and do not know what they are saying; at least Latins understand the word *calumniator* [slanderer].

Thus no mistake has been made in the text. As for my *Annotations*, it is permitted for the sake of an inquiry to propose various meanings there, since it is open to the reader to adopt the one he judges to be the best.

From chapter 5 [on Eph 5:32]

Sacramentum hoc magnum est [this is a great sacrament]: I had pointed out that the word in the Greek text is *μυστήριον*, that is, 'mystery.' And I accept matrimony as one of the sacraments, but I add that this 'cannot very well be deduced from this passage,' for whatever is a mystery is not immediately one of the seven sacraments of the church. Here Zúñiga – who is not on home turf here[560] – makes himself the more ridiculous the more words he gushes forth. First, he should have shown that the word *sacramentum* in the wider sense applies to many things that are not among the seven sacraments of the church, for there are many signs of holy things, whereas *sacramentum* in its specific sense consists of the visible signs of the holy act. These signs, however, are accompanied of necessity, as if by a [divine] pact, by invisible grace.[561] Zúñiga should have explained this, if he had wanted to engage in a disputation with me.

Peter Lombard[562] and with him the theologians of old do not count matrimony among the church sacraments properly so designated. The more recent ones began to number it among the sacraments, and I gladly agree with them. If Zúñiga is indignant because I deny that the joining of husband

* * * * *

559 Matt 16:23

560 Erasmus considers Zúñiga's 'home turf' to be philology rather than theology or history of the church. Cf. *Adagia* III vi 62.

561 Grace is the defining element of a sacrament, according to the definition in Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* (c 1155), which was the standard textbook of scholastic theologians. See also next note.

562 Lombard did in fact count matrimony as one of the sacraments, but in a restricted sense, that is, a 'remedy' against fornication rather than a bestowal of grace (*Sententiae* 4.2.1 PL 192 841–2).

and wife is a 'great sacrament,' let him know that Augustine[563] called it the 'least' for the same reasons that I deny it to be 'great.'

But in this matter I have answered Lee earlier on.[564] I shall not deal with Zúñiga because in this whole discussion he has, as they say, 'run beyond the olive trees.'[565] Yet it is worthwhile hearing how he applauds himself, as if he had successfully reached the finish line. 'Erasmus of Rotterdam is ignorant of this,' he says. He calls me ignorant when he himself does not know what he is talking about. If Zúñiga is wise, he will hereafter keep to his own turf, that is, to his dictionaries and quinquagenarian annotations. By doing so he will take better care of his reputation.

From the Epistle to the Philippians [on Phil 1:1]

Paulus et Timotheus [Paul and Timothy]: I point out in very modest terms that the name Timotheus is incorrectly pronounced in our churches, with a short penultimate, when neither the Greek nor the Latin rules of accent permit this. Here Zúñiga thinks that it is sacrilege to condemn anything customarily done in churches. I on the contrary consider it a holier purpose to have many things changed that are now customary. Nevertheless I change nothing – I merely point it out. And I know that in *paracletus*, *idola*, *Iacobus*, *Andreas*, and some other words the Greek accent has been adopted, in others even the quantity of the syllable has been changed, especially in the poetry of Prudentius.[566] Yet this excuse has no place in the case of 'Timotheus.' But, Zúñiga says, the accent could have been taken from oblique cases. Anyone so desirous of being inventive in defense of customs, whatever they may be, will be a welcome champion to all ignorant men.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Phil 1:1]

Cum episcopis et diaconibus [with the bishops and deacons]: I show that there are two variants in the Greek manuscripts, *συνεπισκόποις*, which means 'co-bishops,' and *σὺν ἐπισκόποις*, which means 'with the bishops.' Zúñiga does not like the first variant; I did not like it either and therefore adopted

* * * * *

563 Augustine *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* 1.21 PL 44 427

564 CWE 72 296–303

565 That is, gone too far and beyond the proper boundaries (*Adagia* II ii 10)

566 Aurelius Clemens Prudentius, Christian poet (348–c 405); Erasmus had discussed these matters also in his *On the right way of speaking Latin and Greek* CWE 26 433, and in his commentary on Prudentius' *Hymns* CWE 29 180.

the other variant in my translation. And this is 'a manifest error of Erasmus,' if we are to believe Zúñiga's marginal summary.

From chapter 2 [on Phil 2:10]

Ut in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur [that every knee be bowed in the name of Jesus]: Since it is *κάμψῃ* in Greek, I show that it can be translated *flectat*, with *se* understood. Yet I do not criticize the Translator's version. Zúñiga believes that very many of the transitive verbs are used in an intransitive sense. I know that, but I believe that they are used in the reflexive sense: *precipitat* for *precipitat se*; *revertit* for *revertit se*.[567] Hilary at any rate reads *flectat*, not *flectatur*, in *De trinitate* [On the Trinity], book 9.[568] Indeed in Latin *deflectere* is commonly used for *se deflectere*. Yet Zúñiga's recension ends on a courteous note, as if he wanted to absolve me. He says: 'unless perhaps he thought that it can be correctly translated either way.' Nevertheless, the marginal summary reads: 'Erasmus' incorrect translation.'

From chapter 3 [on Phil 3:5]

Ex genere Israel [of the stock of Israel]: I had noted that Israel here can be taken as a nominative case,[569] so that the meaning would be: I am Israel, that is, an Israelite, not by adoption, but 'of the stock,' so as to set himself apart from proselytes. Just as above[570] Paul calls himself 'circumcision' instead of 'circumcised,' in this case, too, 'Israel' is put for 'Israelite.' I added that Paul 'had done this elsewhere as well,' but I did not mean – as Zúñiga falsely interprets – that he called himself 'Israel' but that he put 'Israel' for 'Israelite.' This is done so frequently in Holy Writ – 'Israel' being put for 'Israelite people' – that there is no need to prove it with examples. But because it is rather awkward to call one man 'Israel' rather than 'Israelite,' I adduced a rather awkward parallel, namely Paul calling himself 'circumcision' instead of 'circumcised.' And in his epistle to the Romans, chapter 9,[571] he says: 'Not all who are of Israel are Israelites.' It cannot be denied that he put 'Israel' for 'Israelites' in this instance.

* * * * *

567 A parallel example in English would be 'shave' or 'wash' (ie oneself).
568 Hilary *De trinitate* 9.8 PL 10 287B
569 In his annotation on the passage Erasmus had said that it 'is the nominative'; in later editions he changed this to 'can be nominative.'
570 At Phil 3:3
571 Rom 9:6

Zúñiga explains that 'Israel' in the present passage cannot be taken as a nominative case.[572] Let him triumph if he can prove this. For when he plays the buffoon, saying that he is surprised that I did not interpret the phrase *ex tribu Benjamin* in the same manner,[573] he should know that men become Israelites by adoption – they do not become Benjamites or Zebulonites. Finally, the very usage of Scripture will provide an answer to Zúñiga's argument. Or else, why does Scripture not call Hebrews 'Abraham' or 'David' in the same manner that it calls them 'Iuda' or 'Israel'?

From chapter 4 [on Phil 4:3]

Etiam te rogo, compar germane [Indeed, true comrade,[574] I also ask you]: I indicate that some Greek exegetes take this passage to refer to the wife of Paul.[575] Theophylact[576] confirms this – Theophylact, who with a change of name has turned into 'Athanasius' for Zúñiga. But Theophylact disagrees with these exegetes, as if there was any risk in believing that Paul had a wife, when Clement in the *History of the Church*, book 3,[577] gave this interpretation, citing the present passage as testimony. To whom should we give more credence – Clement, a man of demonstrated sanctity and skilled in the Greek language, who lived close to the apostolic age, or Theophylact? And Theophylact so completely shies away from the idea of a wife that he prefers the man about whom Paul is speaking to be the husband or brother of another woman or even the custodian of the jail. What you have here is pure guesswork on Theophylact's part. How much more plausible is the conjecture I offer in my annotations. Nor does Theophylact offer any evidence to prove the other writers wrong, except an argument based on one word which Paul uses in the masculine gender and would have used in the feminine if he had spoken about his wife. He is thinking of *γνήσιε* [true] if I am not mistaken.[578] For everyone knows that *σύζυγος* [comrade] denotes either sex. Indeed, those

* * * * *

572 Zúñiga is wrong. The proper name is indeclinable and can therefore be any case, unless there is an article clarifying the case.

573 Zúñiga meant to say that Erasmus had been inconsistent in taking 'Israel' as a nominative and 'Benjamin' as a genitive.

574 Literally, 'yoke-fellow'

575 For example, Origen *Comm in Rom* PG 14 839

576 Theophylact *Comm in Phil* PG 24 1192C

577 Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.30

578 Erasmus' hesitation is due to the fact that he was not able at the time to consult the Greek text of Theophylact; the Latin text does not clarify the point of objection.

who believe that this refers to his wife were Greeks and nevertheless were not troubled by what troubled Theophylact. Hence it follows that they either read *γνησία* or thought, according to Attic custom, that the masculine was used instead of the feminine.[579] Thus while I think that this view should not be mocked as absurd, I admit that the other one is possible as well. The only thing that is troublesome is that Paul gives a male companion to women, contrary to his habit.

But I wonder why Theophylact takes offense here at *γνήσιος* for *γνησία*, when he is not offended by *σωτήριος* for *salutifera* [the feminine form] in the Epistle to Titus, chapter 2.[580] For this is both his reading and his interpretation there. Moreover, since it is customary with Attic speakers to use the masculine for the feminine adjective, for example when Homer[581] says *κλυτός* for *κλυτή* and Euripides[582] *γενναῖος* for *γενναία* – what gave offence to Theophylact here?

Moreover, who might that custodian of the jail be, whom Paul thinks worthy of such honour that he calls him 'true comrade,' a title he never even gave to Timotheus – and yet he prefers the women to this man?

Ibidem, note 2 [on Phil 4:9]

Haec cogitate et agite [Dwell on these things and practice them]: Here we have once again a 'manifest hallucination of Erasmus.' In this case 'I was out of my mind,' whereas it was Zúñiga who was quite out of his mind, dreaming that I am speaking about the earlier verse [4:8] 'Dwell on what you have learned.' In this case we have only one reading, *λογίζεσθε*, with all Latin manuscripts in agreement. But a little later there follows 'practice these things.' Here some Latin manuscripts repeat 'Dwell on these things and practice them and the God of peace will be with you.' But, he will say, these manuscripts are faulty. Yes, indeed, and for this very reason I made a note of the matter, that the mistake should not spread farther. In this passage the interlinear *Gloss*[583] reads: 'Do not only dwell on them but also implement them in deed.' Moreover, lest Zúñiga believe that this mistake appears only in my manuscript – at the time of writing my note, I consulted an old

* * * * *

579 This is generally correct (see Erasmus' examples for this usage in the next paragraph), but it is not documented for *γνήσιος*.

580 Titus 2:11

581 Homer *Iliad* 2.842

582 Euripides *Hecuba* 592

583 Ie the *Glossa Ordinaria* which appeared as an interlinear commentary in one of the manuscripts Erasmus used for his edition. See n76 above.

text that contains the *Ordinary Gloss* and which comes from the Carthusian library not far from Brussels.[584] There we read: 'Dwell on these things and practice them.' Let Zúñiga go now and clamour that I was out of my mind when I wrote this.

From the Epistle to the Colossians [on Col 1:2]

His qui sunt Colossis [who are at Colossae]: I had said that the Colossians here are not to be mistaken for Rhodians.[585] Zúñiga shows that the Rhodians were called Colossians, after the colossal statue of the Sun, and that the same people were also called Lindans.[586] This may be so, but it is no argument against me, unless perhaps Zúñiga believes that this is proof that the epistle was addressed to the Rhodians.

From chapter 2 [on Col 2:22]

Quae omnia in interitu sunt ipso abusu[587] [which all refer to things destined to perish with consumption]: In Greek we read *ἀποχρήσει*, literally *abusu* [consumption], which is how I translated it. Zúñiga believes that *ἀπόχρησις* [consumption] can be interpreted as *χρήσις* [use]. Nor do I deny this; nor have I criticized the Translator, but I had read in law books that *abusus* is specifically used of things that are consumed by use, as of food and drink, while *usus* is used in connection with buildings, gems, or money. Since *abusus* is the technical term for the matter of which Paul was thinking and since it corresponds more closely to the Greek word, I preferred to put it into the text.

From chapter 3 [on Col 3:9]

Expoliantes vos veterem hominem [laying aside the old man]: I have translated *ἀπεκδυσάμενοι* by *exuistis* (the Translator renders it *expoliantes*): 'after you have taken off [*exuistis*] the old man.' Zúñiga shows that *expoliari* also denotes someone whose clothes are taken off. He offers an example out of Cicero[588] who describes someone as *expoliatum* whom the lictors deprived of his

* * * * *

584 The Carthusian monastery at Anderlecht. According to Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-2 217), Erasmus used the printed edition, Strasbourg 1481.

585 This misconception originated in the lexicon of Ambrose of Calepio (1440–1511), first printed in Reggio in 1502 and reprinted many times. The misidentification was eventually removed.

586 The reference is to the colossal statue of Helios, the sun god, built by Chares of Lindos in 290 BC and destroyed by an earthquake in 224 BC.

587 The Vulgate has *usu*. Erasmus translated *abusu*.

588 Cicero *In Verrem* 2.4.40.86

clothes. But Paul does not speak here of clothes torn off violently, but taken off voluntarily. Yet I did not say that the Translator rendered it incorrectly.

From chapter 4 [on Col 4:16]

Et cum lecta fuerit [and when it was read]: Since the Latin manuscripts have *epistola ad Laodicenses* [Epistle to the Laodicensians] for the Greek *καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικαίας*, that is, 'that which comes from Laodicaea,' I cited the Greek scholia to show that the epistle to which Paul refers here was not written to the Laodicensians since he says 'written from Laodicaea.' And they conjecture that it was an epistle which some Laodicensian[589] had written to Paul, but in which there were things that were important for the Colossians to know. Zúñiga notes in his marginal summary that I 'did not understand the Greek scholia.'[590] How would this impudent fellow know, when he has never laid eyes on the Greek scholia?

But Athanasius disagrees – Theophylact,[591] that is, whom Zúñiga erroneously believes to be Athanasius – although 'Athanasius' cites two views: one which assumes that this epistle was written by Paul to Timothy from Laodicea; the other which says that this epistle was written to Paul by some Laodicean. Pray, what is there that Erasmus misunderstood and Zúñiga understood? The rest is not relevant to me.

From the Epistles to the Thessalonians, chapter 2 [on 1 Thess 2:7]

Cum possemus vobis oneri esse [since we could be a burden to you], in Greek *ἐν βάρει*: According to the Greek exegetes,[592] *ἐν βάρει* can be interpreted in two ways, that is, 'grave in authority and respect,' or *ἐν βάρει*, that is 'burdensome because of expense.' I am more in favour of the first meaning.[593] Zúñiga, lest he agree with me on anything, argues the latter at length. He adduces some passages in which Paul attests that he caused them expense. What does this prove? The question is, what did Paul mean in the present passage? And I indicate the reason why I favour the first reading: because the words *ἐν βάρει* are preceded by 'not seeking glory' and followed by 'but we

* * * * *

589 The question remains unresolved; Erasmus appears to follow the lead of Jerome *De viris illustribus* PL 23 650A on the apocryphal epistle and also to agree with Photius' comment in Pseudo-Oecumenius, PG 119 53D.

590 Ie Pseudo-Oecumenius; see preceding note.

591 Theophylact *Comm in Col* PG 124 1276D

592 Erasmus is referring to Pseudo-Oecumenius, *Comm in 1 Thess* PG 119 68D.

593 Modern exegetes tend to agree with Erasmus.

were made like children' or 'made content.' Ambrose[594] reads *honori* [honour] for *oneri* [burden], but even assuming that this is a corruption, he certainly adopted in his exegesis the view to which I subscribe. 'Athanasius'[595] relates both views in a manner that would suggest that one is free to adopt whichever one prefers. What then is the point of Zúñiga's marginal summary 'This passage was incorrectly translated by Erasmus'? Is someone 'incorrect' who translates according to the opinion of the Greeks and of Ambrose and who adopts what agrees more readily with what precedes and what follows?

Ibidem, note 2 [on 1 Thess 2:7]

Sed facti sumus parvuli [but we were made children]: Zúñiga admits that all Greek manuscripts which he himself has seen had *ἤπιοι* [content], not *νήπιοι* [children]. Yet he indicates on the authority of Athanasius that there were once two variants.

What Zúñiga teaches on the authority of his pseudo-Athanasius, I taught in the first edition on the authority of the genuine Theophylact.[596] What then is Zúñiga's argument against me? 'The Translator rendered this correctly,' he says – as if I denied that.

From chapter 5 [on 1 Thess 5:23]

Ut integer spiritus vester [may your spirit be perfect]: Because Jerome had not yet been revised and corrected at this point and I used texts that were marked and crossed out,[597] I was somehow under the mistaken impression that Jerome had not touched on *ὁλόκληρον* [complete].[598] Soon afterwards, when I noticed my mistake, I corrected it.

From 2 Thessalonians, chapter 2 [on 2 Thess 2:5]

Non retinetis quod cum [do you not retain what …]: Since the Greek is *μνημονεύετε*, that is, 'you remember,' I express surprise at 'the Translator's silly predilection for *copia*.'[599] He preferred to use a word that was ambiguous

* * * * *

594 Ambrosiaster CSEL 83 216
595 That is, Theophylact *Comm in 1 Thess* PG 124 1290A
596 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Thess* PG 124 1289B
597 Erasmus is referring to the Basel edition of Jerome, on which he collaborated and which appeared in 1516 (see n27 above). Working on Jerome's letters, Erasmus had presumably collated earlier editions and marked up the printer's copy accordingly.
598 See Jerome *Ep ad Helvidiam* CSEL 55 *Ep* 120.12.5.
599 That is, translating the same Greek word with a variety of Latin words

and was not good Latin rather than the proper, customary, correct word. Here my friend Zúñiga says: 'Oh Erasmus of Rotterdam, silly and quite ignorant of the Latin language!' What can be more impudent than this man? Erasmus is 'quite ignorant of the Latin language' because he prefers to say *non memini* instead of *non retineo*? Let Zúñiga cite even one good author who used *retinere* for *meminisse*. If he is unable to do so, let him confess that it is he who is 'quite ignorant of the Latin language,' since he thinks there is no difference between *retinere* and *meminisse*. It would have been more tolerable if he had said *tenere* for *meminisse*, although *tenere* is applied to someone who understands rather than remembers, unless you say *tenet memoria* [keep in mind]. But *retinere* is very different from *tenere*. It is ridiculous of Zúñiga to cast into my teeth Seneca's epistles to Paul – as if any educated man believed that they were written by Seneca.[600]

But note how Zúñiga heaps up insults in so unfair a case: 'As if anyone could ever be found,' he says, 'so uneducated and so like Erasmus, that is, so feebleminded and thick-witted, that he fails to understand that in this passage *non retinetis* is the same as *non meministis*.'

From chapter 3 [on 2 Thess 3:10]

Hoc denunciabamus vobis [we gave you these instructions]: I preferred to translate *παρηγγέλλομεν* [we instructed] by *praecipiebamus*. In this context I criticize the Translator in two or three words because he preferred to say *denunciabamus* rather than *praecipiebamus*, often striving for *copia* without any reason.[601] What does Zúñiga want, then: that we should be permitted to use *denunciare* for *praecipere* indiscriminately? Would he allow someone to call the *γαμικὰ παραγγέλματα* of Plutarch[602] *connubiales denunciationes*? In lawbooks I have read the phrase *denunciatio novi operis* [protest against a new building][603] – I don't know if the word can be found in Latin literature in the sense of 'instructing.' 'Then, why do you yourself translate it in a similar manner in the same chapter?' Zúñiga asks. Because I passed it over, thinking it was enough to point it out once.

* * * * *

600 Erasmus published the letters in his edition of Seneca's works (Basel 1515), but pointed out their apocryphal nature in his preface (Ep 325:79–81) and again in his preface to the 1529 edition (Ep 2091:146–8).

601 See n599 above.

602 An essay in Plutarch's *Moralia*; the title was usually translated as *Praecepta conjugalia* (Marriage precepts).

603 *Corpus iuris civilis*, *Digesta* 39 tit 1

From the first Epistle to Timotheus, chapter 1 [on 1 Tim 1:3]

Sicut rogavi te ut remaneres Ephesi [as I asked you to remain in Ephesus]: Because the phrase lacks a verb, I supplied myself what was understood: 'As I have asked you to remain in Ephesus, do remain,' or as I translated it: *ita facito* [do so]. Zúñiga cries out that a crime has been committed because I dared to add a word of my own, as if the Translator had never done so and as if it were not sometimes necessary.

As for Zúñiga's opinion that *προσμεῖναι* can be interpreted as an imperative [remain!] [604] – he has not quite understood my point. I did not want Paul's actual words to be understood as an imperative but said that this was their underlying meaning. For the same verb *προσμεῖναι* is understood, but in a different mood.[605]

As for my saying that Ambrose has *ut denuncies* [to instruct], when the word there is *denunciares*, why does he not assume that this error must be imputed to the printers rather than to me? [606] Moreover, when he adds that I, together with my friend Valla, am wrong in my belief that it is more in keeping with the context if Greek *παρεκάλεσα* [asked] is taken as hortative rather than interrogative – the mistake is obviously Zúñiga's, for I rather disagree with Valla. My words are: 'Yet *hortatus sum* [I exhorted], Valla's preference, is more appropriate – although Paul sometimes used this word in addressing the common people.' That this is so is plain from my translation, for it runs as follows: *quemadmodum rogavi te ut remaneres* [as I asked you to remain]. And even if I had been in complete agreement with Valla, what risk was there when the meaning was ambiguous – which cannot be denied. Or is it not permitted to disagree with Theophylact?[607]

Ibidem, note 2 [on 1 Tim 1:3]

Ne aliter docerent [not to teach otherwise]: Since *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* has two meanings in Greek and appears to refer to the disciples often changing teachers rather than teaching different things, I translated: *ne diversam sequantur doctrinam* [not to follow a different teaching] – a phrase that suits either interpretation. Here Zúñiga registers strong disapproval without proving

* * * * *

604 The verse continues: 'I asked you to remain in Ephesus … that you may instruct certain people not to follow a different teaching.'

605 That is, in the imperative, but Erasmus' defense is cryptic.

606 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 202; the text has *denuncies*; the variant *denunciares* cited by Zúñiga is not recorded.

607 Theophylact PG 125 13B remarks that Paul's choice of words meant that he asked 'not as a teacher, but as a servant.'

anything. He casts into my teeth the Greek summary[608] of that epistle which seems to interpret it as men teaching different things. What is new in this? I myself state that Theophylact and Chrysostom interpret it in this fashion.[609] Nor do I disagree with them, nor they with me. For they do not say that it cannot be interpreted in any other way. Nor do I condemn the interpretation they adopt.

From chapter 3 [on 1 Tim 3:6]

Non neophytum, ne in superbiam etc. [not a new convert lest he become conceited … and fall under the same judgment as Satan]: Here I once again translate *calumniator* [slanderer] instead of *diabolus* [Satan].[610] But Zúñiga demonstrates with the help of much testimony out of the exegetes that this passage can be applied to the devil. I did not deny this – but he failed to demonstrate that it cannot be applied to a slanderous man. Yet I have already provided some answers concerning this matter [at Eph 4:17].

Ibidem, note 2 [1 Tim 3:11]

Mulieres similiter pudicas [women likewise chaste]: Since Paul is concerned here with the household of the bishops which includes deacons and the wives and children of deacons, I had said that in this passage it would be more correct to translate *uxores* [wives] rather than *mulieres* [women], since the Greek word, *γυναῖκας*, is ambiguous. Nor was I unaware that Theophylact and Chrysostom,[611] and especially the Latins,[612] recoil from mentioning 'wives,' thinking even then of celibacy, a custom priests may enjoy in perfect safety, since there is such a large number of them. Yet there are among them many who live less chastely than if they had taken a wife.

Moreover, I did not consider there what the exegetes expounded but what Paul appears to have meant. And if the meaning I give has nothing

* * * * *

608 Ie brief introductions to the individual books of the New Testament (the so-called Euthalian hypotheses). For the introduction to 1 Tim, see LB VI 923–4. There, as Zúñiga pointed out, the meaning is given as 'lead astray into a false doctrine.'

609 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Tim* PG 125 13; Chrysostom *Hom in 1 Tim* PG 62 506

610 See n558 above.

611 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Tim* PG 125 48; Chrysostom *Hom in 1 Tim* PG 62 553; Zúñiga had quoted the two authors in support of his view that the passage refers to deaconesses.

612 Zúñiga had also quoted Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 268, who interprets 'women' to refer to Christian lay women.

impious, nothing absurd in it, I think I may be pardoned for disagreeing occasionally with the exegetes of old, when there is no danger to piety or faith. And if the commentaries of Origen and others on the passage were extant, I have no doubt that they would give an explanation different from that of Ambrose.[613]

As for the other stuff Zúñiga heaps up, I have no mind to examine it since it does not pertain to me.

From chapter 4 [on 1 Tim 4:3]

Abstinere a cibis quos Deus creavit [abstain from the food God created]: In the first edition *quos* was corrupted through the carelessness of the printers and changed to *quae*, which was corrected in the second edition. Here Zúñiga accuses me of 'extraordinary raving.' And this kind of mistake – he says – I myself somewhere criticize in the Translator. If the Translator had erred in this manner in one or the other passage, I would have assumed that it had happened through the fault of scribes. But as it is, he stumbles over the same block so often that it cannot be regarded as a coincidence.

Here Zúñiga admonishes me to remember that I am human. Good advice – but he reminds the mindful.[614] Rather let him admonish himself who so proudly and arrogantly castigates not only the errors of others, but also well-reasoned arguments. 'The man who undertakes to speak up against another ought to be free of all fault,' Zúñiga says. Then why does he rage so insolently against another man's work, when he himself commits so many embarrassing mistakes in this slim booklet, the first-fruit[615] of his genius? What does he want? Shall we refrain from correcting the mistakes of others unless we ourselves are completely free of all error? But since no one of this description can be found, no one will have a right to mend what has been corrupted by others. Why then did Ambrose, Jerome, and Cyprian write against the errors of heretics, when in their own works some things are found that are of the same stamp?[616] Here it will perhaps be valuable to contemplate our own errors so that we may rage less against the errors of others and show greater mercy, but we mustn't overlook them.

* * * * *

613 Ie Ambrosiaster. See preceding note.
614 A proverbial expression; see *Adagia* I ii 12.
615 This was not Zúñiga's first publication. See n15 above.
616 For such irregularities in the Church Fathers, see n328 above.

Ibidem, note 2 [on 1 Tim 4:6]

Enutritus verbis fidei et bonae doctrinae [nourished by the words of faith and of sound doctrine]: The Greek text runs: *ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας*. Zúñiga condemns my translation, *enutritus in sermonibus fidei et bona doctrina* [nourished by the words of faith and by sound doctrine]. First of all, it makes no difference to the meaning. Furthermore, since I do not mention it at all in my annotations and he can see it corrected in the second edition, he ought to have suspected that it was done through the carelessness of the printers.

Next I had pointed out that *ἐντρεφόμενος* [nourished] could be understood in the active sense. And it does not seem to be an absurd interpretation. Zúñiga shows that the exegetes interpret it differently. And to prove this he quotes a great deal out of his 'Athanasius' and Ambrose.[617] Why was it necessary to show this when I was neither unaware of it nor denying it? All the same, is it not permitted to indicate an alternative meaning when the Greek text admits of either?

Ibidem, note 3 [on 1 Tim 4:15]

Haec meditare [dwell on these things]: I translated *καὶ ταῦτα μελέτα* by *haec exerce* [engage in these things]. As for the rest, I criticize Cardinal Hugh in my annotation for interpreting the verb *meditari* in this fashion: '*meditare*, that is, turning over in one's heart through sustained memory.'[618] And I added the exclamation: 'O mataeologian, that is, more than a theologian!' For *meditari* means to engage in something.' Here Zúñiga, as if hired as Hugh's advocate, rages against me, uttering fierce insults, because I dare to call so great a man a mataeologian, that is, 'a worthless and vain theologian.' For this is how Zúñiga interprets the word, but incorrectly – that was not my meaning when I said mataeologian; rather I said jokingly that he is more than a theologian, by one syllable.[619]

The rest of the passages in which *meditatio cordis* occurs and which Zúñiga heaps up and draws from the sacred books,[620] are irrelevant. For

* * * * *

617 Theophylact PG 125 56B and Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 273, both of whom interpret the Greek word in the passive sense

618 Hugh of St Cher (c 1190–1263), the author of *Postilla*, a widely used commentary on the Bible; Erasmus cites his remarks on 1 Tim 4:15.

619 Erasmus is equivocating. Zúñiga correctly understood the word (literal meaning: 'foolish-speaking') as an insulting pun on 'theologians.' It is tell-tale that Erasmus removed the offending phrase in later editions.

620 Zúñiga listed five passages, among them Ps 18:15.

no one denies that this activity [*meditari*] can be carried on in the mind, for example, when someone rehearses in his mind what he is to say to his prince and in what order and how he is to express it, he dwells (*meditatur*) on the speech in his heart. Thus a man who turns over in his mind what Holy Writ says in order to practice in his life what it teaches dwells on it (*meditatur*). But my point in criticizing St Cher was that he thought that in this context *meditari* was nothing more than keeping in mind. And Ambrose and the *Ordinary Gloss* explain it as a reference to action in life.[621]

Toward the end Zúñiga explains that Paul, if he had thought of physical action, would have said *γύμναζε*, a verb he uses elsewhere, *γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτόν* etc. What is Zúñiga's point? That *μελετᾶν* can refer only to the mind and *γυμνάζεσθαι* only to the body? Both are blatantly false. For *γυμνάσματα* can mean mental exercises and *μελέται* physical exercises.

From the second Epistle to Timotheus, chapter 1 [on 2 Tim 1:12]

Scio enim cui credidi [for I know whom I have believed]: I demonstrated that *ὅτι* [that], which follows, refers to the preceding clause *ᾧ πεπίστευκα* [whom I have believed] and that the meaning is: 'I know and am persuaded that he whom I have believed is able to safekeep what I have committed to him.' Nor is there any disagreement between Zúñiga and myself, except that I say the same thing more elaborately, pointing out another meaning in passing and approving of it, in case anyone prefers to adopt it – a meaning, however, which differs very little from the first. Yet Zúñiga says in his marginal summary 'Erasmus has rendered this passage incorrectly,' whereas I have rendered it more clearly. And in Zúñiga's note we read that 'Erasmus has not understood the apostle's words.' O shame- and senseless man!

Ibidem, note 2 [2 Tim 1:16]

Det misericordiam Dominus Onesiphori domui [the Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus]: I preferred to translate *Onesiphori familiae* [the household of Onesiphorus]. Zúñiga admits that *domus* here can be interpreted as 'household.' He merely condemns the ambiguity inherent in my translation because what follows, 'for he often refreshed me,' etc, could be applied either to the household or to Onesiphorus. What can be more foolish than Zúñiga when the same ambiguity exists in the version of the Translator? Yet he condemns my translation as ambiguous, but refrains from condemning

* * * * *

621 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 277; the interlinear *Gloss* (see n76 above) had 'follow this with frequent action.'

that of the Translator, defending it in fact as being flawless. Yet he fails to show how ambiguity can be avoided. It could have been avoided by adding the pronoun *is* [he]: *quoniam is saepe me refrigeravit* [for he often refreshed me].

'Onesiphorus is said to have been at Rome and asked Paul' etc: None of this is incompatible with [translating] 'household,' if you read the Greek. But granted that it can be applied to Onesiphorus, surely he was not in Rome all by himself but with some members of his household.

From chapter 2 [on 2 Tim 2:15]

Recte tractantem verbum veritatis [rightly dividing the word of Truth]: Here I had translated Greek *ὀρθοτομοῦντα* by *recte secantem* [rightly cutting].[622] Although the old orthodox exegetes are in complete agreement in interpreting it in this sense, Zúñiga nevertheless decided to attack the fact that I translated *secantem* instead of *tractantem* [carrying out], although I did not at all reprehend the Translator's version and merely explained more lucidly what Paul wrote and meant.

I will not discuss at present whether Greek *ὀρθοτομεῖν* means *recte tractare* in Latin, as Zúñiga explains; perhaps the Translator was at a loss for other words to render the Greek. No one will understand Ambrose's interpretation at any rate, unless he understands the precise meaning of the Greek word. I shall quote his comment because it seems to me useful not only for the present purpose:[623] 'Because (he says) there are some who say that discussion benefits the hearers. The apostle, however, knowing that it was more of an obstacle, advised everyone to be persuasive without being contentious, calling those undignified who rely on disputation. For disputation is necessarily contrived, indeed many things are said contrary to one's conscience, so that a man loses inwardly in his soul while outwardly departing as the winner. For no one can bear defeat, even if he knows that what he hears is true. And he 'divides rightly' [*recte tractat*] and with good conscience who speaks with willing and peaceful men. Thus there ought to be agreement among God's servants, not disputation.' Thus Ambrose. What he advises here, Chrysostom[624] advises also in many passages. How far removed from

* * * * *

622 *Secantem*, literally 'cutting' (as in cutting a road through territory) parallels the literal meaning of the Greek word. It is, however, used metaphorically for 'carrying out,' and the Latin term does not have the same metaphorical force. Using the translation *tractantem* (carrying out) is therefore clearer.

623 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 305–6

624 Chrysostom, for example, *Hom in Gen* 33:3 PG 53 308–9, argues that disputes should be avoided and are injurious to the church.

this rule are those today who tear each other apart with virulent pamphlets and words, acting with mean cruelty against their brother while acting with shameful flattery toward princes – but let others be the judges of such behaviour. It is clear at any rate how Ambrose interprets the meaning of *recte secare*: by cutting off what is contentious and leaving what is peaceful and beneficial, one 'cuts rightly' [*recte secat*]. Indeed, those things that are harmful have been cut away.

Chrysostom writes in this manner:[625] 'For many people tear this apart everywhere and pluck it apart, and will mingle with it much harmful seed. He does not say *dirigentem* but *recte tractantem*, as if he said: cut away whatever adulterated matter appears and strive with all your might to have the rest of this kind cut out, and as with whips and lashes cut off with the sword of the Spirit what is superfluous or foreign to the gospel teaching.' Thus Chrysostom. Theophylact agrees with him, saying:[626] '*Recte tractantem verbum veritatis*: and even if many people pluck this word apart and transfer it elsewhere, you must nevertheless divide it rightly [*pertracta recte*].' *Pertracta*, he says, means this: 'cleave and cut away everything that is useless and all speech that is foreign to the preaching of the gospel and take it away with the sword of the Word.' Nor does the *Gloss* differ – that patchwork which people for some reason call *Ordinary*. The interlinear commentary (perhaps taken from Bede's commentary) runs thus:[627] 'according to individual ability, that he may distribute spiritual food to the mature, milk to the little ones.'

We see that all exegetes interpret the precise meaning of the Greek word as derived from 'cutting,' whereas *tractare* does not mean 'cut' for any Latin speaker.

Yet volumes, which the Latin call *tractatus* [tractates] are called tomes in Greek and 'tomes' is derived from 'cutting' because in old times they wrote on parchment, cut in such a manner that it could be rolled around a stick.[628] But *tractari* is also used of those things that are 'discussed.' And the part cut from a meat sausage or from a leg of pork is called *τόμος* [a cut] in Greek.

* * * * *

625 Chrysostom *Hom in 2 Tim* PG 62 626C–D, quoted in the Latin translation Erasmus had at his disposal at the time. See n124 above.

626 Theophylact *Comm in 2 Tim* PG 125 109A, quoted in the fifteenth-century Latin translation of Christopher Porsena (see CWE 73 203 n73).

627 For the interlinear *Ordinary Gloss* see n76 above.

628 Or rather, a cut from a large roll of papyrus, of a length needed for a book

From chapter 3 [on 2 Tim 3:2]

Cupidi, elati [covetous, boasting]: Greek *ἀλαζόνες*, which the Translator translated by *elati*, I translated by *fastuosi* for which, as I had indicated, Ambrose[629] reads *insolentes*. Jerome[630] in his commentary on Micah reads *fastidiosi*, but I suspect that the word was *fastuosi*. Finally, Plautus[631] translated it *gloriosus*. Zúñiga is indignant because I changed the Translator's word even though *elatus* and *fastuosus* mean practically the same. I myself believe that there is some difference. For a person can be *elatus* without giving himself airs or being boastful. And this is what *fastuosus* properly means.

But granted that there is no difference, why does he accuse me rather than Ambrose or Jerome? If nothing else, *elati* was certainly an ambiguous word, for even those being buried are said to be *elati*[632] – if I may be permitted a joke.

Ibidem, note 2 [on 2 Tim 3:8]

Quemadmodum autem Jambres et Mambres [like Jannes and Jammes]: I had indicated that *Jambres* and *Mambres* are explained in the *Liber vocum Hebraicarum* [Book of Hebrew Words][633] as having the same meaning in Hebrew. Zúñiga does not deny the truth of what I indicate, but says that it is an incorrect explanation. And I myself note it with surprise, to give the reader an opportunity to investigate. Yet his marginal summary runs: 'An error of Erasmus in the Hebrew language.' Is it an error to cite the mistake of another? I don't think so – to approve of it is an error.

Ibidem, note 3 [on 2 Tim 3:16]

Ad corripiendum [for correction]: Here Zúñiga has nothing to reprehend in my translation. He merely offers criticism because in my *Annotations* I add a few words, saying that in Ambrose[634] *καταρτίωσιν* [correction] appears to be added, or because Zúñiga is more in favour of *κατάρτισιν*. Zúñiga approves of the fact that I added nothing in the text. But in my opinion

* * * * *

629 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 311
630 Jerome *Comm in Mi* 2 CCL 76 509
631 Titus Maccius Plautus (d 184 BC), Roman playwright; he 'translated' the term in the sense that his play *Miles gloriosus* (The Braggart Soldier) is an adaption of an older, Greek play titled *Ἀλαζών* (The Braggart).
632 The word is used in this sense (ie being carried out for burial) in Livy 30.45.4.
633 Ie the names of both sorcerers are explained by the same etymology as 'a sea made of skins' or 'a sea in its origin' PL 23 901/2.
634 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 316

I did well to comment on Ambrose's interpretation – as anyone will find upon examination.

From chapter 4 [on 2 Tim 4:6]

Ego enim iam delibor [For I am already being poured out in libation]: I had translated the Greek phrase *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι* by *nam ipse iam immolor* [for I am already being sacrificed], for first of all *delibor* is an ambiguous word for Latin speakers,[635] and secondly it is not known to everyone. And although Ambrose reads *delibor*, he nevertheless does not shy away from the word *immolare* [sacrifice] in his exegesis.[636] But Chrysostom[637] indicates that there is this difference: *libamen* is wholly offered to God; this is not the case with *immolatio* (as Theophylact[638] also said of the difference between *θυσία* and *σπονδή*). Perhaps this difference is inherent in the Greek words according to Old Testament usage, but I do not think that the same distinction exists between the Latin words, except that *libare* in Latin means to pour something out in God's honour before tasting it.

From the Epistle to Titus, chapter 1 [on Titus 1:1]

Huius rei gratia reliqui te Cretae [for this reason I have left you in Crete]: Since it is *ἐν Κρήτῃ* in Greek, I had noted that the Translator removed the preposition from the name of the island, contrary to grammatical rules.[639] Zúñiga does not deny this – and how could he? But he casts into my teeth Jerome[640] who wrote somewhere *et in quibusdam insulis, praecipueque Siculae et Rhodi* [and on some islands, especially Sicily and Rhodes]. I did not deny that one can say in Latin *insula Siciliae* or *insula Rhodi*. I denied that one can say in Latin *habitat Cretae* [he lives in Crete] rather than *in Creta*, or *studet Rhodi* [he studies in Rhodes] instead of *in Rhodo*. If Zúñiga can demonstrate that this can be said in Latin, the victory is his.

* * * * *

635 *Delibari* has a considerable range of meanings, from its literal meaning 'to be taken away' to 'being infringed upon or diminished,' 'violated,' 'sacrificed.' Ambrosiaster (CSEL 81 316) takes it to mean 'sacrificed.'

636 See preceding note.

637 Chrysostom *Hom in 2 Tim* PG 62 652, a passage quoted by Zúñiga

638 Theophylact *Comm in 2 Tim* PG 125 129

639 *Cretae* is the locative case, which in classical Latin is reserved for cities; all other place names (in this case, an island) require the preposition 'in.'

640 Jerome *Prologus in Ier 4* CSEL 74 174

Ibidem, note 2 [on Titus 1:7]

Non superbum [Not proud; in Greek: *μὴ αὐθάδη*]: I translated *praefractum*. Zúñiga says he does not know the meaning of *praefractus*. Nor, he thinks, do I understand the word I used. I am surprised that the word is new to Zúñiga, a man who has spent an eternity on the best of authors, when it is found in Cicero, *De officiis* [On Duties], book 3:[641] 'I myself,' Cicero says, 'disagreed even with my friend Cato. It seemed to me too authoritarian [*praefractum*] to defend the treasury and the spoils.' Nonius Marcellus cites a similar example out of Cicero's *Hortensius*:[642] 'They were opposed by Aristochius,' he says, 'an authoritarian [*praefractus*], a man made of iron, for whom nothing was advantageous unless it was right and honest.' Moreover, the Greek word *αὐθάδη* denotes one who is excessively pleased with himself, overly tenacious in his views. And that 'Athanasius' (Theophylact, that is)[643] interpreted it in this sense is apparent from what he adds: 'acting according to his opinion and without consulting his subjects.' For one who is *praefractus* does not listen to the opinions of others. And Hesychius[644] is clearly on my side when he interprets *αὐθάδης* as *αὐτάρεστος* [self-satisfied, self-willed].

From chapter 3 [on Titus 3:10]

Haereticum hominem post unam, etc [After admonishing a heretic once, etc]: Greek *αἵρεσις* means *secta* [sect] in Latin; the adjective has no equivalent except *factiosus* [factious]. Wishing to speak Latin I therefore translated *factiosus*. And in passing I criticized our age which labels anyone who disagrees with any scholastic opinion a 'heretic.' Zúñiga shows that in this passage those are called heretics who are teachers of erroneous views. It is true that someone can be *factiosus* without erring in faith. Yet the word *factiones* is applied to factions among philosophers who disagree among each other, and one who is *hereticus* can at the same time be *factiosus*, if he gets others to join him. Nevertheless, I changed this in the second edition because of quibblers.

From the Epistle to Philemon [on Philem 9]

Propter charitatem magis obsecro [I prefer to appeal for the sake of love]: For Greek *παρακαλῶ τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης*, the Translator put *cum*

* * * * *

641 Cicero *De officiis* 3.22.88

642 *Hortensius* fragment 38; Nonius Marcellus was a Roman grammarian who lived in the fifth or fourth century BC.

643 Theophylact *Comm in Titum* PG 125 149

644 Zúñiga had quoted the entry in Hesychius' lexicon. See n373 above.

sis talis ut Paulus senex [since you are an old man like Paul]. I translated: *cum sim talis nempe Paulus senex* [since I am such a man, that is, old like Paul]. Ambrose[645] seems to have read as the Translator translates; Jerome,[646] on the other hand, as I translate. Here Zúñiga does not seem to have a very good case. Not at all bashful, he merely holds out a possible defense for the old translation, but in no way does he defend the Translator, unless one is willing to accept that *τοιοῦτον ὄν* stands for *τοιοῦτον ὄντα*.[647] But in my opinion it would be more plausible to say that it stands for *τοιούτου ὄντος*. For in Greek the nominative is sometimes put for the genitive in similar constructions.

From the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 1 [on Heb 1:6]

Et cum iterum introducit [and again when he introduces] *εἰσαγάγῃ* in Greek: I translated 'introduces' *inducit*. Zúñiga believes that *introducit* is better. I am of the opposite opinion. *Introducitur* is used of one who is led into the innermost chamber; conversely *inducitur* (rather than *introducitur*) is used of one who is brought on to the stage. But, one might object, *eisagogai* [introductions] are called *introductiones*. True, but by those who speak Latin badly; the rest call them *institutiones*. For the fact that the Translator renders it in the same manner in other scriptural passages does not incriminate me, nor does it help Zúñiga's cause.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Heb 1:7]

Qui facit angelos suos spiritus [who made the angels his spirits]: I translated *qui creat angelos suos spiritus* (Greek: *ὁ ποιῶν*). Zúñiga does not deny that *ποιεῖν* [do, make] can sometimes be translated by *creare*, as in 'in the beginning God created heaven'[648] etc. But here he speaks of existing angels. Thus, I explained more clearly and lucidly the meaning of the apostle. Or else the meaning of *qui facit angelos suos spiritus* could be 'he changed his angels into spirits.' For something is said to 'become' or 'be made' when it has been different earlier on.

Ibidem, note 3 [Heb 1:8]

Ad Filium autem: thronus tuus Deus [but to the Son: Your throne, God]: I pointed out the ambiguity of the Greek phrase, and in the first edition I had

* * * * *

645 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81 338
646 Jerome *Comm in Philem* PL 26 647C
647 Zúñiga had advocated the accusative case, as the object of 'I appeal.'
648 Gen 1:1

adopted a meaning different from that given by the exegetes.[649] In the second edition I eliminated the pronoun *ipse* [himself].[650] Here Zúñiga casts in my teeth my 'inexperience' with the Hebrew language, for according to Hebrew usage, the nominative is put instead of the vocative, which in Hebrew is lacking. I was not unaware of this. Had I been unaware of it, there would have been no question of ambiguity.

From chapter 2 [Heb 2:1]

Propterea abundantius oportet observare [Therefore we must attend all the more]: In Greek this is: *διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως ἡμᾶς προσέχειν*. I translated: *propterea opportet nos vehementius attendere iis quae dicta sunt nobis* [therefore we must more earnestly attend to what is said to us]. Here Zúñiga's marginal summary reads: 'Erasmus' inappropriate translation.' I am asking you, dear reader, does *προσέχειν* mean *observare* [observe] or rather *attendere* [attend to]? And which of us is the 'paraphraser'? Does one give an 'inappropriate translation' if one gives a more lucid and more literal and a less ambiguous translation? For *observat* can be used of one who practices something or of one who is lying in wait or of one who obeys. Nevertheless, Zúñiga admits at the end that he wrote a note here for no other reason than to keep anyone from suspecting that the Translator had not given an appropriate translation, whereas I had. O idle prattler!

From chapter 3 [on Heb 3:17]

Quorum cadavera [their bodies]: I translated *κῶλα* as *membra* [limbs], not *cadavera* [bodies or corpses].[651] We agree on the meaning. Nor can it be denied that Greek *κῶλα* means 'limbs,' not 'bodies.' But Zúñiga fears that someone might think the Jews collapsed in the wilderness, cut 'limb from limb.' A great risk! Indeed, there was a greater risk that someone reading *quorum cadavera conciderunt* should think that the corpses of the Jews were walking around in the wilderness at first and then collapsed. O grave annotations, worthy of Zúñiga!

* * * * *

649 Erasmus had suggested that 'God' could be either nominative or vocative. Theophylact read it as a nominative PG 125 200A.

650 In the first edition (1516) Erasmus had translated: *Thronus tuus ipse Deus in seculum seculi* (your throne is God himself, forever and ever). In the second edition (1519) he omitted *ipse*.

651 The meaning 'corpses' (as in Num 14:29) is not found in classical usage.

From chapter 5 [on Heb 5:1]

Omnis namque pontifex, [in Greek] *πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεύς* [for every high-priest]: I translated *nam omnis sacerdos* [for every priest]. Zúñiga acts as if *pontifex* in Latin meant 'high priest.'[652] But this is not the case. Otherwise why would the Romans use the term *pontifex maximus* for high priest? Yet I see that practically all of our manuscripts have *pontifex* for *ἀρχιερεύς*. And in former times *sacerdos* denoted not just any priest but a bishop. But it could be that my text had *ἱερεύς*, not *ἀρχιερεύς*, especially when it says 'every.' Not all who celebrate mass are high priests. And yet I restored *pontifex* for *sacerdos* in my second edition, so that Zúñiga cannot claim any credit on that account.

From chapter 6 [on Heb 6:8]

Proferens autem spinas et tribulos [but bearing thorns and thistles]: In my first edition the text ran: *spinas et tribula*.[653] Here Zúñiga has a stranglehold on Erasmus and shows the difference between *tribulum* [neuter], an agricultural implement, and *tribulus* [masculine], a fruit or plant. But he could have concluded that this had happened through the negligence of the typesetters, for I made no mention of the matter in my *Annotations*, and he can see that I corrected in my second edition the mistake they made.

From chapter 7 [on Heb 7:2]

Primum quidem qui interpretatur rex iusticiae [firstly, his name means 'king of justice']: Here there is no reason why Zúñiga should disagree with me. I indicate that the booklet added to the Bible, *Interpres nominum Hebraicorum* [Interpreting the Hebrew Names], is not Jerome's, for I say 'which is bandied around under Jerome's name.'[654] And certainly his name appears in the title of some texts. Zúñiga agrees with me and plainly denies that it is Jerome's. As for the rest, since it is not relevant to me – 'good riddance!'[655]

* * * * *

652 *Pontifex* is used for 'bishop,' eg in Jerome Ep 108.6.1. From Tertullian on, *sacerdos* came to be used for 'bishop' (eg Ambrose *De officiis* 1.2 and 1.216) but *sacerdos* usually means 'priest.'

653 That is, Erasmus had mistakenly given a neuter ending to the masculine *tribulus*.

654 Erasmus quotes his annotation on the passage. On the ascription to Jerome see n181 above.

655 A proverbial expression (*Adagia* II i 4), here quoted in Greek

From chapter 8 [on Heb 8:2]

Sanctorum minister [attendant of the sanctuary]: I had indicated in the *Annotations* that *λειτουργὸς* strictly speaking means 'attendant of sacred things,' thinking of course that it was used in this sense by Christians, seeing that the Greeks called *λειτουργία* what we call 'mass.' Zúñiga believes that even pagan attendants can be termed *λειτουργοί*. Who denies it?[656] In this sense pagans may be *diaconi*, although we use the word for attendants at mass. The Greeks believe that those are termed *λειτουργοί* who serve the magistrates on public business in the court and senate.

From chapter 9 [on Heb 9:5]

Super quae erant cherubim gloriae [above it were the cherubs of glory]: Since it is *ὑπεράνω αὐτῆς* in Greek, it could not be translated *super quae* [above them];[657] rather, the Greek phrase refers either to the tabernacle or to the ark. And in my translation I adopt what Zúñiga prefers. Only in my *Annotations* I add: 'In my opinion it could more rightly be applied to the tabernacle.' Why I thought so, would be too lengthy to explain here. Therefore I have decided to keep this for another time.[658]

From chapter 11 [on Heb 11:1]

Est autem fides sperandarum substantia rerum [faith is confidence in what we hope for]: I had said that this was not a dialectical definition, as some thought, but the beginning of an encomium. Zúñiga denies this. I was not unaware that this was labelled a definition by Jerome[659] and the others, nor do I deny that it is a kind of definition. Rather, I made light of the gloss in

* * * * *

656 In classical Greek, the word was generally used for domestic servants and slaves.

657 Erasmus means: The Greek pronoun is feminine and can therefore refer to either 'tabernacle' or 'ark,' feminine words in Greek. The Latin pronoun *quae*, used in the Vulgate, is grammatically wrong. Erasmus replaced it with the feminine *hanc*, which can refer only to 'ark' since the Latin word for 'tabernacle' is neuter.

658 No such explanation was forthcoming. Erasmus deleted the sentence in later editions.

659 Jerome *Comm in Gal* PL 26 448C

the decretals[660] which analyzes this definition according to the strict rules of dialectic. But concerning this matter I have earlier on replied to Lee.[661]

Ibidem, note 2 [on Heb 11:30]

Fide muri Hiericho corruerunt circumitu dierum septem [Because of faith the walls of Jericho fell after an encirclement of seven days]: In Greek the text runs *κυκωθέντα ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας* [encircled for seven days], which I translated *cincta ad dies septem*.[662] Here Zúñiga cries out that I 'have not understood' the Greek phrase – as if I had not read the well-known story that tells of the army having surrounded the city and having done so every single day until the seventh, and on the seventh the ark was carried around and at the sound of the priests' trumpets the walls collapsed. What exactly is the point of Zúñiga's reproach? The fact that my translation is ambiguous, [in his opinion]. For I seem to be speaking of a siege of seven days. But the Translator gives an even more ambiguous version. For he seems to say that the walls collapsed within seven days, that is, seven days going by, whereas they marched around the city walls once every day until the seventh day. On that day they marched around seven times, and after the seventh round the walls collapsed (Joshua 6).

From chapter 12 [Heb 12:16]

Qui propter unam escam vendidit primogenita [who sold his birthright for a meal]: Since it is *ἀπέδοτο* in Greek, which literally means 'gave in return,' I translated *permutavit*, more closely approaching the Greek word. *Permutatio*, however, is a type of sale in which you give to your partner whatever he desires in exchange for what you receive. And this is 'Erasmus' wrong translation,' if we are to believe Zúñiga's marginal summary.

From chapter 13 [Heb 13:23]

Cognoscite fratrem nostrum Timotheum [know that our brother Timothy]: *γινώσκετε* means either 'know!' or 'you know.' I translated it in the indicative mood: *scitis*. Zúñiga clamours that I have given a wrong translation.[663] Why

* * * * *

660 Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-2 243) cites the *Corpus iuris canonici* (ed. Sebastian Brant, Basel 1500), where Heb 11:1 is explicitly said to be 'not a good definition' and is contrasted with the scholastic (*magistralis*) definition.

661 CWE 72 321–2

662 The Greek word contains the notion of 'circling around,' whereas the Latin *cincta* means 'encircled,' which suggests 'besieged.'

663 In Zúñiga's marginal note

'wrong,' I ask, when the Greek expression is ambiguous and either meaning makes sense? 'But,' says Zúñiga, 'the Greek expression itself clearly proves …' – how can what he himself calls ambiguous 'prove' anything?[664] And of what expression is Zúñiga thinking here, when he, who is such an expert in correct Greek diction, thinks it is correct to say *ἐλλογεῖτο* for *ἐνέλογεῖτο*?[665]

From the Epistle of James, chapter 1 [on James 1:11]

Et decor vultus illius deperiit [and the loveliness of its face is gone]: Since it is *πρόσωπον* in Greek, I preferred to translate *aspectus*, a less awkward metaphor,[666] rather than *vultus*. Zúñiga is not averse to the metaphor *vultus*. A matter worth wrangling over!

Ibidem, note 2 [on James 1:11]

Ita et dives in itineribus suis marcescet [thus also the rich man withers on his travels]: In Greek it is *πορείαις*. If you take away the 'e,' it will be *πορίαις*, meaning *abundantiis*, 'abundance.'[667] This is what I adopted because it agrees better with the context. Zúñiga likes the traditional reading better. No one prevents him from enjoying it, nor do I condemn it. Furthermore, when Zúñiga suspects that I translated by mistake 'in abundance' rather than 'on his travels,' and then 'covered up my error in the *Annotations*,' he would not venture this guess if he did not measure others by his own standard.

Ibidem, note 3 [on James 1:13]

Deus enim intentator malorum est; [in Greek] *ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν* [for God is not tempted by evil]: Zúñiga wants *ἀπείραστος* interpreted actively, meaning 'he does not send evil.' But analogy with similar Greek forms suggests otherwise. For *γνωστόν* is not used of one who knows but rather of that which can be known or is known.[668] Nor does what follows – 'but he himself

* * * * *

664 Zúñiga began his note with the words 'Although *γινώσκετε* is ambiguous.'

665 See above, p 8.

666 An 'awkward' metaphor because *vultus* (face) in this verse refers to the landscape; the Greek *πρόσωπον* does not present the same problem because it can mean both 'face' and 'aspect.' Erasmus' translation is therefore preferable.

667 There is no Greek word *πορία*; the correct word for abundance is *εὐπορία*. Zúñiga was right to suggest that *πορεία* means (life-) journey. In later editions Erasmus changed his translation to *in viis* (on his travels) without, however, changing his annotation on the passage.

668 Erasmus means that Greek adjectives ending in *-τον* usually have a passive meaning, which is generally, but not always, the case.

tempts no one' – permit [Zúñiga's interpretation]. If *ἀπείραστος* means 'who does not tempt' and the phrase 'but he himself tempts no one' follows, James plainly says the same thing twice. But the Greek particle *δέ* indicates that what follows is a contrast.

But, [Zúñiga says], I added two words of my own: *ut* and *ita*.[669] What of it? I wanted to express the meaning more clearly rather than preserve the number of words and obscure the meaning. And here the marginal summary criticizes Erasmus' 'wrong' translation.[670]

Ibidem, note 4 [on James 1:22]

Estote autem factores verbi et non auditores tantum [But you must not only listen to, but also act on the word]: I indicated that the Greek manuscripts did not add 'only.'[671] Zúñiga advises us that it was added in the Rhodian manuscript. But I have already explained that in my opinion that manuscript was corrected after ours, especially because the Rhodians had dealings with the Roman church.[672] And yet there is nothing at risk, whether it is added or understood. And when I said it was missing in the Greek manuscripts, I was of course referring to those I had been able to inspect.

From chapter 2 [on James 2:16]

Ite in pace, calefacimini [go in peace, keep warm]: I preferred to translate Greek *θερμαίνεσθε* [keep warm] by *calescite* rather than *calefacimini*. Zúñiga tells us that the Translator was keeping within the rules of grammar when he translated *calefacimini*. For according to Priscian the men of old said *facio* and *facior*, whereas we say *fio*. What does Zúñiga achieve with such arguments?[673] Only that one may translate *calefacimini* with as much justification as one might say for 'In our time virtue is held in contempt by everyone' *virtus hoc seculo apud omnes parvi facitur* instead of *parvi fit*.[674] O magnificent defender of

* * * * *

669 Erasmus had expanded the translation to read: *Nam Deus ut a malis tentari non potest, ita nec ipse quenquam tentat* (For just as God cannot be tempted by evil, so he himself does not tempt anyone).

670 The marginal note reads: 'Erasmus' improper and wrong translation.'

671 Erasmus had therefore translated 'not listen but act' according to the reading in the manuscript which he had used as printer's copy.

672 A Latin archbishopric was erected on Rhodes in 1328. For Zúñiga's use of the 'Rhodian' manuscript see n331 above.

673 Priscian in *Grammatici Latini* 2 398, speaking of archaic usage

674 An example to demonstrate that archaic usage is out of place in contemporary phrasing

the Translator! Zúñiga could have cited this insignificant remark of Priscian in a more correct manner.

From chapter 3 [James 3:7]

Et serpentum et ceterorum [and serpents and the rest]: Since it is *ἐναλίων* [sea animal] in Greek, one cannot translate 'the rest,' and I suspect, as Valla suggests, that the Translator wrote *cetorum* [sea animals], not *ceterorum* [the rest], or if he wrote *ceterorum*, that he read, not *ἐναλίων*, but *ἄλλων* [other].[675] Zúñiga denies that *cetorum* can be found in any Latin manuscripts. Yet Valla saw this reading.

From chapter 5 [on James 5:15]

Et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum [and the prayer uttered in faith will save the infirm]: Since 'infirm' is *κάμνοντα* in Greek, I translated *salvabit laborantem* [will save him who is laboring]. For *infirmus* can be used of someone who is not ailing. Zúñiga shows that Greek *κάμνειν* sometimes refers to an ailment, and he is right, except that the same goes for Latin *laborare*, which is sometimes used of ailing people. What crime has been committed therefore?

From 1 Peter, chapter 2 [on 1 Pet 2:3]

Si tamen gustastis, quoniam dulcis est Dominus [if, however, you have tasted that the Lord is sweet]: The word translated by 'sweet' is *χρηστός* in Greek; I translated the phrase *benignus est Dominus* [the Lord is kind]. Zúñiga tells us that *χρηστός* sometimes means 'sweet,' but he does not offer any proof other than that the Translator translates it elsewhere in this manner as well.[676] He does not deny, however, that it sometimes means 'good' or 'kind.'[677] But because of the verb 'taste' he prefers 'sweet' rather than 'kind' in this case. And what will he do in the case of the Psalm 'Taste and see how sweet is the Lord'?[678] Sweetness cannot be seen. A taste of goodness and kindness is enjoyed spiritually. Or is it not acceptable to call a song 'sweet'? Although to Zúñiga nothing is sweeter than to disparage a person.

* * * * *

675 Erasmus is mistaken. Lorenzo Valla does not comment on this passage.
676 Zúñiga cited Ps 24:8.
677 Zúñiga cited Ps 118:68 and 68:17.
678 Ps 33:9

Ibidem, note 2 [1 Pet 2:5]

Superedificamini domos spirituales, [in Greek] *οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός* [you are built as an edifice of the spirit]: I show on the basis of the Greek manuscripts that the Latin ones have been corrupted and I restore the original reading, removing the manifest solecism.[679] Zúñiga acts as if I had attributed this solecism to the Translator; I impute it to the corruptors of books.

Ibidem, note 3 [1 Pet 2:7]

Vobis igitur credentibus honor, [in Greek] *ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* [to you who have faith it is of value]: I translated *Vobis igitur preciosus est qui creditis*. I reject the interpretation of Lyra,[680] who renders it thus: 'It will be an honour to you in heaven.' Peter, by contrast, is concerned with 'the stone that has been rejected by the Jews' and was held in high honour by those who obtained salvation by their faith, according to the prophet: 'The stone which the builder rejected was made the keystone.'[681] Zúñiga admits that the Greek word *τιμή* denotes both value and honour. On this point at least we agree. But, he says, if Peter had wanted to say 'valuable,' he would not have said *ἡ τιμή*, but *ἔντιμος*, as he did earlier.[682] As if Peter was not at liberty to vary his speech, and as if it were not a peculiarity of the Hebrew language to use abstract for concrete nouns.

But, [he says], the article in *ἡ τιμή* argues against me. On the contrary: it argues in my favour, for it denotes that value of which he had spoken a little earlier on,[683] that special value which brings eternal salvation.

Now, Bede[684] differs somewhat from me in words, but agrees in substance. Zúñiga is triumphant in his marginal summary: 'Lyra defended against Erasmus' slander, and Erasmus refuted.' Where are they now, those

* * * * *

679 Erasmus replaced the accusative with the correct nominative form.

680 Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-2 249) cites Lyra, *Postilla* (Paris 1590), who explained the passage: 'It will therefore be an honour to you who believe; supply: in heaven.'

681 Ps 117 (118):11

682 At 1 Pet 2:6, quoting Isa 28:16

683 Erasmus is referring to the Greek practice of using an article like a predicate after a previous mention of the noun.

684 Bede *Expositio in 1 Pet* PL 93 50A explains the verse: 'If anyone serves me, my Father will honour him.'

magnificent resources with which he defends Lyra and strikes me down? O Zúñigan (rather than Spanish) fumes![685]

Ibidem, note 4 [on 1 Pet 2:14]

Sive ducibus tanquam ab eo missis [or the leaders he sent]: Since it is *ἡγεμόσιν* in Greek, I preferred, *praesidibus* [governors] to *ducibus* [leaders], for this passage does not deal with warfare but with those who administrate the provinces and whom Peter wants even Christians to obey. Furthermore, since Zúñiga admits that I have a point when I note that the Translator usually translates [this word] in the manner in which I translated it here,[686] and since I do not condemn the Translator's version but instead give reasons why I prefer the word *praesides* to *dux* – what does Zúñiga want from me? This is how his books grow in size.

From chapter 4 [on 1 Pet 4:15]

Nemo autem vestrum patiatur [let no one among you suffer]: I had translated Greek *πασχέτω* [suffer] by *affligatur* – to exclude capital punishment, but to include prison, flagellation, stoning, and the other forms of punishment. Zúñiga tells us on his own authority that *pati* here means nothing but suffering the death penalty and in the same breath says that my translation is 'inappropriate.'[687] The victory is Zúñiga's if *patitur* is used only of one who suffers capital punishment and if *affligitur* cannot be used of one who is killed.

From 2 Peter, chapter 2 [on 2 Pet 2:2]

Et multi sequentur eorum luxurias [and many will follow their luxurious ways]: Since it is *ἀπωλείαις* in Greek,[688] I had translated *pernicies* [wickedness] instead of *luxurias* [luxurious ways]. I add a conjecture: that the Translator may have read *ἀσωτίαις*, a word which properly speaking denotes luxury and does not differ very much from *ἀπωλίαις* – that is, by two little letters. Here Zúñiga acts as if he had read *ἀσελγίαις* for *ἀσωτίαις* in many old manuscripts,

* * * * *

685 *Fumus Hispanicus* [Spanish smoke] is a term connected with a number of herbs, notably garlic. See eg the German dictionary of Charles Gottlob Küttner (Leipzig 1809), sv 'Spanischer Rauch.'

686 For example, at Matt 10:18 and 27:2

687 Zúñiga's marginal note says 'Erasmus' improper translation.'

688 There is scant evidence for reading *ἀπωλείαις* (wickedness) rather than the generally accepted *ἀσωτίαις* (luxury).

whereas he had read it in the one Rhodian manuscript[689] – if he read it there. This manuscript does not carry much weight with me, for I suspect that it was corrected after our manuscripts so that it might agree with the Latin reading; but granted that the Translator read *ἀσελγίαις* – even though *ἀσελγία* does not mean luxury proper, but rather lasciviousness – what is there in my note that deserved to be pursued with insults? In Zúñiga's marginal note we read 'Erasmus' manifest error'; and in his annotation 'Erasmus is wrong in his conjecture' and 'reports falsely.' Do such words not reveal that he is seriously afflicted with the vice of malice?

From chapter 3 [on 2 Pet 3:13]

In quibus iusticia inhabitat [in whom justice dwells]: I show that 'in whom' could be applied to us who are hoping for justice, that is, 'we in whom justice dwells.' This does not find favour with Zúñiga, yet he does not refute what I have proposed, except by the logic that the words 'heavens and earth' occur a little earlier. But 'we' (contained in the verb *προσδοκῶμεν* [we are looking forward])[690] precedes it immediately. And here we read in the marginal summary: 'Clearly a hallucination on Erasmus' part.'

From 1 John, chapter 1 [on 1 John 1:1]

Quod fuit ab initio; [in Greek] *ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* [what was from the beginning]: I translated *quod erat* because I preferred the sense 'was and still is.' For *fuit* [has been] is used of what has ceased to be. Zúñiga shows that *ἦν*, the past imperfect, is sometimes used for the perfect. Erasmus does not deny that, but it does not disprove that the translation preferred by me is the more convenient one.

From chapter 3 [on 1 John 3:16]

In hoc cognovimus charitatem Dei [in this we came to understand the love of God]: I indicate that 'of God' is not added in the Greek manuscripts. Once again Zúñiga casts into my teeth his Rhodian manuscript – one manuscript, and a suspect one at that, as I have often said before.[691] I am supported by innumerable manuscripts.

* * * * *

689 See n331 above. Yet Erasmus added the variant to his annotations in the third edition of his New Testament (1522).

690 The complete verse runs: 'We are looking forward to new heavens and a new earth, in which justice dwells.'

691 See n331 above.

From chapter 5 [on 1 John 5:7–8]

Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant in coelo [Because there are three that give witness in heaven]: Here Zúñiga shows on the authority of Jerome[692] that the Greek manuscripts are clearly corrupt.[693] But where is that Rhodian manuscript of his hiding out?[694] For I had not undertaken the task of emending the Greek manuscripts, but merely to render in good faith what is found in them.

Since Zúñiga's slander was anticipated by his forerunner, Lee, whom I answered in a published book,[695] I shall deal with Zúñiga in fewer words here.

St Jerome in his preface to the canonical epistles[696] voices the suspicion that this passage was corrupted by Latin translators and that some omitted the testimony of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Yet Cyril[697] cites this passage as it stands in our edition in the work entitled *De thesauro* [On the Treasure], Book 14, second last chapter. I shall quote his words: 'Again,' he says, 'John says in the same epistle: "Who is it that overcomes the world if not he who believes that Jesus is the son of God? He comes through the water and the blood and the Spirit – Jesus Christ, not only in water, but in water and blood. And the Spirit is the one who provides the testimony. For the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who give testimony: the Spirit, water, and blood, and these three are one. If we accept the testimony of men, the testimony of God is even greater,"' etc. Thus far Cyril, an orthodox exegete, if I am not mistaken. And it is not plausible that in battling the Arians[698]

* * * * *

692 Ps Jerome *Praefatio in septem Epistolas Canonicas* (ed Wordsworth-White, 3 230–1). This prologue preceded the Vulgate text from the sixth century on, but its authenticity was questioned already in the eighteenth century. Erasmus himself did not raise the question of its authenticity.

693 The passage (the so-called Comma Johanneum) 'The Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit. And these three are one. And there are three who give testimony on earth' is absent from almost all Greek manuscripts. It appears in the Vulgate only from about 500 AD.

694 Ie Zúñiga who so frequently appeals to the reading of the Rhodian codex made no reference to it here, no doubt because it too was missing the passage in question.

695 For the discussion with Lee about the Comma Johanneum see Erasmus' apologia, CWE 72 403–14.

696 See n692 above.

697 Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria from 412–444 AD, in *De thesauro* PG 75 616A–B

698 The passage, as it appears in the Vulgate, was considered a key prooftext against the Arians, who denied that the second Person of the Trinity was equal (*ὁμοούσιος*) to the first.

and collecting scriptural testimony against them, he would omit this weapon with which they could have been completely undone, had he either known or believed that this had been written by the apostle.

Before him Bede[699] carefully and at length expounded the triple testimony on earth, yet failed to mention the testimony in heaven of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit. Nor was this author without skill in the languages or without diligence in studying the old manuscripts. In fact he does not even add 'on earth.' He reads only 'there are three who bear witness.' In the manuscript which was supplied to me by the library of the Franciscans at Antwerp[700] the words about the testimony of the Father, the Word, the Spirit were written as a marginal gloss, but in a more recent hand, so that it is obvious that it was added by some scholar who did not want this clause to be omitted.

But I am hard pressed by the authority of Jerome,[701] which I at any rate do not wish to slight, although he often twists the meaning and is rather bold, often wavers and fails to be consistent as one would wish. Yet I do not quite see what Jerome means in this passage. I shall quote his own words: 'But,' he says, 'just as, long ago, I corrected the evangelists according to the true reading, I also restored the [Catholic epistles] to their proper order, with God's help. The first one among them is a single one by James, then two by Peter, three by John, and one by Jude. If they had been as faithfully turned into Latin by the translators as they were arranged by them, they would cause no difficulty for the reader nor would the speech be at variance and contradictory. Especially in the passage in the first epistle of John about the unity of the Trinity, where we find that unfaithful translators have wandered far from the truth of the faith and put only three words (that is, water, blood, and Spirit) in their edition, omitting the testimony of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and this in a passage that greatly strengthens the Catholic faith and affirms the one essence of the divinity of Father, Son, and Spirit.' Thus far I have quoted Jerome's words. It is obvious from them that Jerome had no complaint about the Greek manuscripts, only about the men who translated from Greek into Latin. And today the words, which he complains

* * * * *

699 Bede *Comm in 1 John* PL 93 114

700 Likely a reference to a manuscript of Bede's commentaries, since in the third edition of the New Testament, Erasmus adds to his annotation on the passage 'nor is there any mention in Josse Bade's edition,' that is Bade's edition of Bede's commentaries (Paris 1521).

701 See n692 above.

had been omitted, are actually absent from the Greek manuscripts and appear in the Latin manuscripts, though not in all of them. But on what basis did Jerome castigate the error of the translators? On the basis of Greek manuscripts of course. But they either had what is in our translation or were at variance with it. If they were at variance, just as the Latin manuscripts are [among themselves], how can one prove which is right and which was written by the apostle, especially when, what Jerome criticizes, was then the text publicly used by the church? If this had not been the case I do not see how what follows makes sense: 'and you, Eustochium,[702] virgin of Christ, while you urgently demand from me the unadulterated text of Scripture, expose an old man to the snapping teeth of jealous men who condemn me as a falsifier and corrupter of Holy Writ.' For who would have called him a falsifier if he had not changed the publicly accepted reading?

When I was in Bruges recently in the retinue of the Emperor[703] I consulted two wonderfully old manuscripts from the library of St Donatian's. Neither had what Jerome complains was missing.

Finally, a very old codex in the Vatican library[704] of the Supreme Pontiff also lacks the triple testimony in heaven, thus supporting my argument. For Paolo Bombace[705] consulted the book and copied the passage for me word for word.

If Cyril read in Greek what the Greek manuscripts have today, if among the Latins Augustine[706] and Bede read only this much or both variants, if manuscripts so old that they could seem to have been written in the time of Jerome agree with the Greek manuscripts, I do not see what argument Jerome can proffer to show that the reading he himself hands down to us is the genuine reading.

But someone will say: This was an efficacious weapon against the Arians.[707] First of all, since it is undisputed that the text contained variants at one time both in the Greek and the Latin manuscripts, this weapon will have no authority against those who will no doubt with equal justification

* * * * *

702 Eustochium (c 368–c 420 AD), daughter of a Roman senator, to whom Jerome addressed several of his works

703 In August 1521; for the manuscripts he used in Bruges see n407 above.

704 The famous Vatican B (Gr 1209), the oldest extant manuscript of the Greek bible, dating from the fourth century AD

705 Paolo Bombace (1476–1527) was prefect of the Vatican library. See Ep 1213:74–92.

706 The reference is presumably to Augustine *Collatio cum Maximino* PL 42 794–5, which Erasmus quotes in his annotation on the passage.

707 See n698 above.

claim the variant that supports them. But let us imagine that there is no controversial reading, since what is said about the testimony of water, blood, and spirit 'being one' refers, not to one nature but to the consensus of the witnesses – do we think that the Arians will be such dullards that they would fail to interpret the passage here about the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, in the same manner, especially since orthodox exegetes actually interpreted it thus with respect to a similar passage in the gospels,[708] and Augustine, arguing against the Arian Maximinus, does not reject this interpretation? Indeed, a section of the interlinear *Ordinary Gloss*[709] interprets this very passage thus: 'They are one, that is, testifying about the same thing.' To flatter ourselves with such logic is not strengthening the faith, but casting doubt on it. Perhaps it would have been better to be zealously pious and become one with God than to be zealously meddling[710] and disputing about how the Father differs from the Son and how the Spirit differs from either. I certainly cannot see how what the Arians deny can be proved except by logical reasoning.[711] Finally, since this whole passage is obscure, it cannot be of great value in refuting the heretics.

But regarding this matter I have answered Lee at greater length in my apologia.[712] I shall add one thing: Since my friend Zúñiga boasts so many times about his Rhodian manuscript[713] and attributes so much authority to it, I wonder that he failed to adduce its oracular voice in this case, especially since it agrees with our manuscripts so completely that it would seem to be a Lesbian rule.[714]

Yet so as not to conceal anything, one Greek manuscript has been discovered in England[715] that contains what is missing in the common ones.

* * * * *

708 Matt 28:19, discussed by Augustine

709 For the interlinear *Gloss*, see n76 above.

710 Excessive speculation concerning doctrinal matters (*curiositas*) is an accusation Erasmus repeatedly directed against scholastic theologians. In his annotation on 1 Tim 1:6 LB VI 926–8 he draws up a long list of 'curious' questions raised by theologians which defy a clear answer and contribute nothing to piety. In his *Methodus/Ratio verae theologiae*, he similarly warns against such undue and unprofitable quibbling: 'Let ungodly curiosity be absent' (CWE 41 427).

711 That is, speculative reasoning in the absence of clear scriptural proof

712 See n695 above.

713 See n331 above.

714 Proverbial (*Adagia* I v 93) for flexible standards

715 After Lee severely criticized Erasmus for omitting the Comma Johanneum, Erasmus challenged him in turn: 'Let Lee produce a Greek manuscript that has written what is lacking in my edition, and let him prove that I had access to

For there the text runs as follows: *ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, πατήρ, λόγος καὶ πνεῦμα, καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσιν. καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ, πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα. Εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων etc.* Although I do not know whether it happened by chance that in this passage the words *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν*, which appear in our Greek manuscripts, are not repeated. Out of this British manuscript, then, I have replaced what was said to be missing in ours – so that no one has any reason to slander me. Yet I suspect that this manuscript too was corrected after the Latin manuscripts. For after the Greeks came to an agreement with the Roman church, they strove for agreement with the Romans in this respect also.

Ibidem, note 2 [1 John 5:20]

Ut cognoscamus verum Deum [that we may come to know the true God]: I had indicated that 'God' was not added in Greek. We only find *τὸν ἀληθινόν*, that is, 'he who is true,' and this is how Hilary cites the passage in *De trinitate Dei* [On the Trinity of God] 6.[716] But, [says Zúñiga], the Rhodian manuscript contains the words. Yet innumerable manuscripts of greater trustworthiness do not have it. But it does not matter if one adds what is understood. For he means God, or certainly Christ.

From 3 John [on 3 John 9]

Scripsissem forsitan ecclesiae [I would perhaps have written to the church]: Since the Greek text has *ἔγραψα*, I translated *scripsi ecclesiae* [I wrote to the church]. Nor is there any inconvenience as far as the meaning is concerned. Zúñiga believes that it could not have been translated otherwise than the Translator did. He proves this by producing a short verse from Psalm 50:[717] *ὅτι εἰ ἐθέλησας θυσίαν, ἔδωκα ἄν* [that I would have offered a sacrifice, if you had wanted it]. A wonderful argument – if a word was added to indicate that the

* * * * *

this manuscript, and then he may accuse me of negligence in sacred doctrines' (CWE 72 408). He restored the passage in the third edition of the New Testament (1522), when it was pointed out to him that the Codex Montfortianus did indeed contain the contested phrase. Modern scholars, however, have established that the manuscript (A 4.21, now at Trinity College, Dublin) was produced around 1520, specifically to embarrass Erasmus.

716 Hilary *De trinitate* PL 10 192A

717 Ps 50:18

phrase was conditional or the complimentary conjunction *ἄν* was added. But in this passage we have nothing of this kind.[718]

From the Epistle of Jude [on Jude 12]

Hi sunt in epulis suis maculae convivantes [these are blemishes at their meals, when the participants]: Since it is *ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις* in Greek I wondered how the word 'meals' had made its way in, for *ἀγάπη* means charity.[719] Zúñiga tells us that charity meals for the poor were once called *agapai*. What Zúñiga points out I found in Augustine, *Contra Faustum* [Against Faustus] 20, chapter 4[720] – although Faustus was the first to use this word, not Augustine. Thus I restored this passage in the third edition. Yet I do not see why *charitates* should be criticized, when the Translator had no qualms to render *εὐλογίας* (denoting small gifts given as a token of affection) by *benedictiones*. Furthermore, since the Latin reads 'at *your* meals' (for the Greek reads *hymon*),[721] *ἀγάπη* cannot mean a meal prepared for the poor as a token of brotherly love.

From Revelation, chapter 1 [on Rev 1:13]

Vestitum podere [ankle-length robe]: The Greek is *ποδήρης*. I criticize Lyra[722] because he thinks *poderem* is derived from *pos* [foot] and *haereo* [hang], that is from a Greek and a Latin word. Zúñiga believes that my conjecture is no less ridiculous than Lyra's when I say that it was derived from *πούς* [foot] and *ἄρω* [fit together]. Zúñiga believes that [the ending] *-ήρης* in Greek words of this kind means no more than *-mentum* in *testamentum*, or *-aris* in *talaris*.[723] Since he only asserts this without proving it, it has only as much weight with

* * * * *

718 Neither Zúñiga nor Erasmus was aware that *ἄν* (indicating a condition) is in fact added in some Greek manuscripts.

719 In Christian writings, *ἀγάπη* can also mean 'charitable or love-feast.' Apparently Erasmus was not aware of this meaning. In later editions of his New Testament, he retained the translation *charitates*, but removed from his annotation on the passage the words indicating his unfamiliarity with the meaning 'love-feast.'

720 Augustine *Contra Faustum* CSEL 25 537

721 The Vulgate had *suis* ('their' rather than 'your'). The Greek manuscripts varied; some had *αὐτῶν* (their); others had *ὑμῶν* (your).

722 Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-2 261) quotes Lyra, *Postilla in Biblia sacra cum Glossa Ordinaria* (Paris 1590) VI, col 1465, which derives *poderes* from '*pos*, that is foot, and *haereo, haeres,* that is, hanging down to the feet.'

723 Modern scholars agree with Erasmus' etymological explanation, that is, the ending *-ήρης* can be derived from *ἄρω,* the (putative) simple form of *ἀραρίσκω,* to fit together.

me as Zúñiga's authority. Nor would it be absurd if *τριήρης* [trireme] and similar words were derived from *ἄρω*.[724]

From chapter 2 [on Rev 2:2]

Et invenisti eos mendaces [and you found them liars]: For Revelation I had only one manuscript, but a very old one; this was shown to me by Johann Reuchlin, that excellent champion of letters.[725] There I found added *καὶ ἐβάπτισας* [and you baptized]. I indicate that this seems to be an error, for there is no mention of baptism in the commentaries. Zúñiga tells us that the Rhodian manuscript had *ἐβάστασας*, that is, 'you tolerated.' I owe this much to the Rhodian manuscript, although there is nothing in the Latin manuscripts that corresponds to this Greek reading.

Ibidem, note 2 [on Rev 2:13]

Et in diebus illis Antiphas [and in those days Antiphas]: Since it is Antipas in Greek, I translated as it was written in the manuscripts. Zúñiga shows that the Translator added an aspirate to many words, for example, Cleophe, Capharnaum, Ephaeneto. He thinks that this was also the case with Antiphas. First of all, how does Zúñiga know whether this was done by the Translator? Secondly, if this happened in a few cases, it does not follow that it can be done anywhere at will.

From chapter 6 [on Rev 6:8]

Et vidi et ecce equus pallidus [and I looked, and behold, a white horse]: I translate in a manner that meets Zúñiga's approval. I merely indicate in the *Annotations* that *χλωρός* sometimes means 'green,'[726] as the Translator renders it a little later.[727] Since Zúñiga does not deny this, I have no quarrel with him on this point.

* * * * *

724 Here Erasmus is wrong. *Trieres* is derived from *eresso* (to row).

725 Reuchlin in turn had borrowed it from the Dominicans in Basel. It was a twelfth-century manuscript that had been left to them by Johann Stojkovic of Ragusa (see n495 above).

726 In his original annotation on the passage, Erasmus had stated in definite terms that *chloros* meant 'green.' Zúñiga pointed out that it could also mean 'pallid.' Erasmus revised his annotation in later editions, saying that the word could 'also' mean green.

727 Rev 8:7 and 9:4

From chapter 10 [on Rev 10:3]

Et clamavit voce magna [and he called with a loud voice]: Here also, I have no quarrel with Zúñiga about the translation. I merely noted that the Greek word was *μυκᾶται*, that is 'lows,' whereas the Translator rendered it *rugit* [roars], adopting this word, I believe, because a lion is mentioned. On this point I have no quarrel with Zúñiga either. The disagreement is about my annotating that in Greek there was perhaps no distinction of words corresponding to the distinction between *mugire* [low] which is the sound proper of cattle, and *rugire* [roar], which is the sound attributed exclusively to lions. Zúñiga shows that the Greeks too have a word for 'roar' – *ὠρύεσθαι* – but that in sacred letters the distinction is not observed, the proof being that *μυκᾶται* in this passage is translated *rugit*, while in Wisdom, chapter 17,[728] *ὠρυομένων* is translated *mugientium*.

From chapter 16 [on Rev 16:4]

Et factus est sanguis, [in Greek] *καὶ ἐγένετο αἷμα* [and was made blood]: I translated *et factae sunt sanguis*, meaning that the waters were turned into blood. Zúñiga denies that this is possible.[729] For just as the evangelist said a little earlier[730] 'he poured his vial into the sea, and it turned into blood' [*factus est*], so here too he should have said *factus est sanguis*. Not at all. Just as we understand there that the sea turned to blood, we understand here that the rivers and springs turned to blood, and there is no reason why we should not say: *et aquae factae sunt sanguis* [and the waters were turned into blood]. And yet we read in the marginal summary: 'An evident hallucination of Erasmus.'

From chapter 17 [on Rev 17:9]

Et hic est sensus, [in Greek] *ὧδε ὁ νοῦς* [and here is the spirit]: In the first edition, in the *Annotations* only, *haec est mens* had been written, no doubt through the mistake of the printers or proofreaders, who were inattentive and turned *hic*, which they suspected was left by me in error, into *haec*.[731] Certainly the second edition, which has *et hic est mens,* shows that this did

* * * * *

728 Wis 17:18; also 1 Pet 5:8

729 Zúñiga interpreted the phrase to mean 'and there appeared blood,' whereas Erasmus connected it with 'rivers and waters,' that is, the rivers and waters turned to blood.

730 Rev 16:3

731 That is, the proofreaders mistook *hic* (here an adverb, 'here') for a pronoun (this) and changed it to the feminine form *haec* to conform with the feminine noun *mens* (mind).

not happen through my fault. And in the annotation I point out that *hic* is an adverb, not a pronoun. Yet in his marginal summary Zúñiga criticizes 'Erasmus' dream-vision,' and in his note he claims that Erasmus, writing thus, is 'mind- and senseless.' But I swear that Zúñiga, in writing this, was not mindless, but displayed an evil mind.

From chapter 18 [on Rev 18:7]

Et in delitiis fuit, [in Greek] *ἐστρηνίασε* [and lived sumptuously]: Since I wrote this in a hurry and there was mention of receiving widows in the Epistle to the Corinthians,[732] I suspected that this was the same as in the first Epistle to Timothy.[733] I owe this much to Zúñiga – lest I fail to acknowledge even the smallest favour.

From chapter 22 [on Rev 22:20]

Etiam veni cito [now I came quickly]: I had adduced some reasons why in my opinion Revelation is not the work of the evangelist John, of which Zúñiga rejects one, turning it into an argument against myself.[734] The reason is that in a very old manuscript which I then used the title was not 'John the evangelist' but 'John the theologian.' Indeed, says Zúñiga, 'theologian' is a suitable epithet for John. He adduces Suida,[735] who calls him 'theologian,' but adds 'and evangelist.' Similarly also Dionysius,[736] writing to him: 'To John, theologian, apostle, and evangelist.' No wonder that Origen,[737] or whoever is the author of those homilies, called John 'theologian,' that is, 'speaker

* * * * *

732 The verse in Revelation goes on: 'for she says in her heart, I sit enthroned as a queen, and am no widow.' In his annotation on the passage, Erasmus had made a cross reference to Corinthians 1 Cor 7:8.

733 1 Tim 5:11, 'But the younger widows refuse.'

734 Doubts about the attribution of Revelation to John have a long history, going back to the third century. The authorship of John was, however, generally accepted during the Middle Ages. Erasmus was the first to revive the objections previously raised. His annotation on Rev 22:20 rehearses these arguments and expresses skepticism about the ascription to John. Modern scholars endorse Erasmus' position, but it exposed him to harsh criticism in his own time.

735 For this lexicon see n198 above.

736 Ps Dionysius, *Epistola 10* addressed to 'John the theologian and evangelist' PG 3 1118–19. Erasmus himself had contested the authenticity of the letters ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, bishop of Athens in the first century.

737 Ps Origen *Homilia super In principio erat verbum* PL 122 283–96, cited by Zúñiga. John Scotus Erigena (ninth century) is now recognized as the author of this work.

of God,' since he had written sublimely about the divine nature of Christ and he honours him with many other similar epithets. Zúñiga can see therefore that this argument cannot be turned against me.

But let this be the end of this prolix quarrel. And it both irks and troubles me that I have devoted seven whole days to this nonsense.[738] If I shall have spectators like Zúñiga, it is better not to produce a play. Let others, who are willing, undertake the task. I in turn shall be a leisurely spectator and benefit from the risk taken by another. I put Zúñiga on notice thereafter to put his time and labour to better use. If I cannot obtain this from him, perhaps a lid to suit the pot[739] will be found. At any rate he will not have me as his sparring partner hereafter.[740] Although here, too, I have fought with a light arm, as they say,[741] not so much replying to the man but hinting at what could be said.

* * * * *

738 We need not take this literally. Erasmus seems to have been engaged in this work (though not exclusively) from 26 June 1521 on (see Ep 1216). The apologia was in press on 23 September 1521. See Ep 1236:64–6 of the same date: 'I have published a laconic defence in reply – an undertaking which I already regret.'

739 *Adagia* I x 72

740 Erasmus was unable to keep this promise. He wrote three other apologiae against Zúñiga, the last one in 1524. See pp 303–31. In addition he published an apologetic letter in 1529; see pp 333–58 below.

741 *Adagia* I iv 27

AN APOLOGIA CONCERNING THREE PASSAGES WHICH THE THEOLOGIAN SANCHO CARRANZA HAD DEFENDED AS RIGHTLY CRITICIZED BY ZÚÑIGA

Apologia de tribus locis quos ut recte taxatos a Stunica defenderat Sanctius Caranza theologus

translated and annotated by

CHARLES FANTAZZI

(ASD IX-8 21–101; LB IX 401–432)

AN APOLOGIA CONCERNING THREE PASSAGES WHICH THE THEOLOGIAN SANCHO CARRANZA HAD DEFENDED AS RIGHTLY CRITICIZED BY ZÚÑIGA

Annotation of Diego López Zúñiga on the annotation of Erasmus to John Chapter 1.[1]

The old translation: 'And the word was with God.'[2] Erasmus in his annotations says: 'For it is the custom of Divine Scripture often to attribute the word God to the Father although it is equally common to all Persons. And I am inclined to think that the name of God is hardly ever openly attributed to Christ in the writings of the apostles or the evangelists except in two or three places.'[3] Zúñiga: The name of God is not openly attributed to Christ in the writings of the apostles and the evangelists except in two or three places, as Erasmus wrote in his ignorance of the Sacred Scriptures, but in many places, as it will be very clearly apparent to those who attentively inquire into it. First of all it must be observed that when the evangelist Matthew[4] referred to Christ citing the prophecy from the seventh chapter of Isaiah 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel,[5] which is interpreted "God with us," he openly called Christ God. Jerome commenting on the aforesaid prophecy of Isaiah spoke thus: 'Therefore here it is to be understood what is said to Achaz:[6] "Therefore may this child who will be born of a virgin, O house of David, now be called Emmanuel by you, that is, God with us, because you will learn from the very facts, O house liberated from two enemy kings, that you have God present to you. Afterwards

* * * * *

1 In the first edition of this work Erasmus attached this criticism of his annotation to John 1:1 published by Zúñiga in his *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti* (Alcalá 1520), but it was omitted in the *Opera omnia* of 1540 and in LB of 1706; however, it is included here, following the example of Henk Jan de Jonge in his critical edition (ASD IX-8).

2 John 1:1. The old translation is the Vulgate.

3 *Annot in Ioh* 1:1

4 Matt 1:23

5 Isa 7:14

6 Achaz was the king of Judah c 732–726 BC. He is mentioned in the genealogy of Christ.

he will be called Jesus, that is, Saviour, because he will save the whole race of mankind. Do not marvel, therefore, O house of David, at the strangeness of the event that a virgin should bring forth God, who has such great power that though he will be born after much time he will free you now, though not called upon.'[7] Not to mention that the gospel of John does nothing else than proclaim the divinity of Christ; since he spoke of that more plainly and more solemnly than the other evangelists he was called the *θεολόγος κατ'ἐξοχήν*, ie the theologian par excellence by the Greeks; and not to mention that Christ called himself God in many passages. The Jews, more aware of this than the Arians, said: 'We do not stone you for your good works but because of blasphemy because though you are a man, you make yourself God.'[8]

It is plainly evident that the philologist and evangelist John called Christ God at the beginning of his Gospel when he said: 'In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and God was the word,' which is said more meaningfully in Greek, *καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, that is, God was the word itself, which means: and this word which was in the beginning and which was with God, that very word was God. That is made clear by the article *ὁ*, which is joined to the word *λόγος*. That same person at the end of his gospel describes Thomas the Apostle as having adored Christ in these words, 'My Lord and my God,' which is said in Greek: *ὁ κύριός μου, ὁ θεός μου*,[9] about which Theophilus said: 'He who previously had been unbelieving, after touching his side, showed himself an excellent theologian for he learned fully the double nature and unique hypostasis of Christ. By saying 'My Lord' he declared his human nature, and by saying 'My God' he declared his divine nature, and the one and the same God.'[10]

In addition, in chapter 20 of Acts[11] Paul said: 'Keep watch over yourselves and over the whole flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers to shepherd the church of God that he obtained with his blood,' which in Greek reads as follows: *προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος*. In explicating this passage Bede spoke

* * * * *

7 Jerome *Comm in Isaiam* 7:14–5 CCL 73 104:64–70
8 John 10:33
9 John 20:28
10 These words are not found in Theophilus Alexandrinus' works in PG 65 33–68. Zúñiga is probably quoting from Thomas Aquinas, *Catena aurea,* an exhaustive anthology of patristic commentary on the Gospels, verse by verse. It contains this same quotation, John 20:26–31.
11 Acts 20:28

thus: 'He does not hesitate to say the blood of Christ because of the union of person in the two natures of Jesus Christ, for which reason it is said "the Son of man who is in heaven."[12] Let Nestorius[13] cease to separate the Son of man from the Son of God and make two Christs.'[14]

At Romans 9: 'To them belong the patriarchs and from them comes the Christ according to the flesh, who is above all things God blessed forever. Amen'; which is in Greek *ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν*. About which Origen said: 'And I wonder how certain people reading what the same apostle says elsewhere: "One God the Father from whom come all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ through whom come all things, etc"[15] can refuse to state openly that the Son of God is God, lest they seem to say they are two gods, and what will they make of that passage in the apostle in which Christ is openly described as God above all things.'[16] Athanasius also in discussing the present passage said: 'And for this reason, marvelling greatly at the charity of God, Paul gives thanks to the only begotten one who is above all things, saying "Blessed be God." "For if others," he said, "reproached God with curses thinking that he did not deservedly receive the gentiles, we who know God's mysteries know that he is worthy of glory and praise." Arius[17] is undoubtedly overwhelmed with shame and ignominy as a result of this, whereas Paul preaches Christ and heaps praise on God everywhere.'[18]

* * * * *

12 John 3:13

13 Nestorius (c 386–450) preached against the use of the title of Theotokos (mother of God) for the Blessed Virgin and would only call her Christotokos (mother of Christ). It was believed in the doctrine of the Nestorians that there were two hypostases in the incarnate Christ, the one divine and the other human.

14 This is a quotation from the *Glossa Ordinaria* at Acts 20:28.

15 1 Cor 8:6

16 Origen *Comm in Rom* 9:5 PG 14 1140C

17 Arius (256–336) was a priest in Alexandria who taught that God the Father was infinite and eternal while the Son is not co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father. This heresy was condemned at the first ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 325.

18 This quotation is not from Athanasius but from Theophylact *Comm in Rom* 9:5 PG 124 461A–B. The Latin translation of the commentary on Paul published at Rome in 1477 was thought to be a translation of Athanasius, but Erasmus discovered at Basel in 1514 the original Greek text of Theophylact (c 1055–1108), archbishop of Ohrid in Bulgaria, a famous Byzantine scholar and exegete, who wrote a commentary on the whole New Testament; on him, see also above, *Apologia contra Stunicam* n122. Zúñiga's quotation is from the Latin translation of Paolo Cristoforo Porsena, papal librarian.

On second Philippians: 'Who though he was in the form of God did not think it robbery to be equal to God.'[19] In Greek it reads: *ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*. On this passage, when he had previously confuted certain heretics whom he names there with this testimony of the Apostle, Athanasius said: 'In the form of God, that is, in the substance of God. "Not made, but existing," he said. And he said something very similar to that: "I am who I am."[20] And he did not think it robbery that he was equal to God. You see the equality,' etc.[21] In addition Ambrose, explaining this passage, said: 'Christ was always in the form of God because he is an invisible image of God.[22] But the Apostle, discussing when the Son of God became man, says: "Make your own the mind of Christ Jesus," that is, concerning God and man, who though he was in the form of God, and yet having lived among men, appeared by his words and deeds to be God.[23] For the form of God does not differ from God. Therefore, he was called the form and image of God, so that it would be understood that not the Father himself was God, but this is what God is, etc.'[24]

On Colossians ch 2: 'For in him dwells the whole fullness of the divinity bodily.'[25] This passage occurs in Jerome's sermon on the assumption of the Virgin,[26] and Hilary quotes it in the second book on the Trinity,[27] which in Greek reads: *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*. On this passage Athanasius says: '"For in him dwells," etc, that is, whatever word God is, he dwells in it. But lest perhaps hearing that he inhabited you may think that by inhabiting he also laboured as the prophets did, in whom God inhabited according to what is written: "and I shall inhabit in them and I shall walk, bodily,"[28] he added, that is not through any activity,

* * * * *

19 Phil 2:6
20 Ex 3:14; God's response to Moses when the Israelites asked for his name.
21 Theophylact *Comm in Phil*, at Phil 2:6 PG 124 1161
22 Col 1:15
23 Phil 2:4–6
24 Ambrosiaster at *Phil* 2:6 CSEL 81.3 139:7–15
25 Col 2:9
26 This sermon is a spurious work of Jerome, a long treatise in PL 30 122–42 answering to a request by Jerome's disciples, Paula and Eustochium, for a sermon on the Virgin Mary. It may also be a work by Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbie at the court of Charlemagne, *De assumptione Mariae virginis* ed. A. Ripberger, CCCM (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis) 56C
27 Hilary *De trinitate* 2.8 CCL 62 46:22–3
28 2 Cor 6:16

but in substance, existing together with the flesh he had put on. Or it can be understood in this way, namely, as in the body, since he inhabits soul and body and lives substantially and inseparably and without any admixture. The soul itself, however, leaves the body when it dies. The word God was never separated from the flesh that was assumed. Even in the tomb it was present to it, and he saved it incorrupt, and descending to hell, he was with this flesh. Therefore, whether preaching or when he freed those enclosed in the confines of hell, the divine Spirit was joined with the body or then also when he died a voluntary death.'[29]

On the second chapter of Titus: 'awaiting the blessed hope and the manifestation of the glory of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ';[30] which in Greek reads *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ᾽Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ* etc. Commenting on this, Athanasius said: 'But where in the world are those who diminish the Son himself in honour and do not allow him to be acknowledged as God? Let them hear how he is God and is outstanding in greatness and this greatness is proclaimed to be God, not to be compared with any inferior being; now because he is great and outstanding, if he saved adversaries and bitter enemies what will he give us if he finds us to be righteous?'[31] Similarly on the letter to the Philippians: 'Who since he was in the form of God,'[32] etc. Of this very passage he said: 'For that the Son is a great God, hear Paul saying, 'the advent of the great God-Saviour Jesus Christ.'[33]

Likewise in the first chapter to the Hebrews, to the Son he says, 'Your throne, o God, is for ever and ever,'[34] which in Greek reads *ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*. For there God is in the vocative case, even if it was in the nominative case in Greek, as we will show fully in that passage. Athanasius, commenting on the same passage, says: 'The angels were created and this is referring to them: "who makes";[35] the Son was not created at all, and "who makes" is not said of him. And furthermore that king is both Lord and God, which the word throne clearly testifies, which is a proof of

* * * * *

29 Theophylact *Comm in Col* 2:9 PG 124 1239B–C
30 Titus 2:13
31 Theophylact *Comm in Titum* 2:13 PG 125 164A
32 Phil 2:6
33 Titus 2:13
34 Heb 1:8
35 'He makes his angels winds' Heb 1:7

supremacy and rule.'[36] This wording goes against Paul of Samosata[37] and Arius, who introduce as a simple man him who was God and reigned over an everlasting kingdom.'

In the first letter of John chapter five: 'Let us be in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ. He is the true God and eternal life.'[38] In Greek it reads *ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ᾽Ιησοῦ Χριστῷ. οὑτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος*. And so reads St Jerome in his explanation of Isaiah,[39] chapter sixty-five, and he hurls this testimony of John concerning the divinity of Christ like a very strong weapon against the imperious Arians.

Behold we have presented ten passages from which it is plainly clear that the name of God was openly attributed to Christ by the apostles and the evangelists. And we are not unaware that many others similar to these can be found in the Sacred books. But we wished to list only these so that from them it may easily appear how frequently this Erasmus of Rotterdam reads the Holy Scriptures, who says that he does not know whether it is read that the name of God was openly attributed to Christ everywhere in the letters of the apostles or the evangelists except in two or three places.

Answer of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam

After long and useless altercations at last I have begun to have dealings with a man who is a true theologian who, if I am to believe the letters of friends,[40] argues learnedly, teaches with restraint, and gives friendly advice. Wherefore, if it is not possible to outdo him in learning, I shall not allow myself to be outdone in modesty. As to his being more partial in his allegiance to his friend Zúñiga, I willingly put up with it because it emanates from a certain pious affection. To favour one's fellow countryman even in a cause that is not very worthy is a kind of piety. But before I deal with the subject itself, what my critic writes about my being frequently equivocating is erroneous, for it is not I who equivocate, quite the contrary, but for the sake of disputation I shall demonstrate in what ways another can equivocate.

* * * * *

36 Theophylact *Comm in Heb* 1:8 PG 125 197D–200A

37 Paul of Samosata was bishop of Antioch (260–68). He was later condemned as a heretic for his teachings on the Trinity. He denied the Son as a subsistence distinct from the Father.

38 1 John 5:20

39 Jerome *Comm in Isaiam* 18, at Isa 65:15–16

40 Erasmus is referring to letters from Juan Vergara and Juan Luis Vives, Epp 1277 and 1281.

<From the Gospel of John, ch. 1>

First concerning 'Emmanuel, that is, God with us':[41] I was not unaware that that passage was introduced by some so that they could prove from it that Jesus Christ is God.[42] And indeed that meaning is strongly approved by me. But let us imagine that we have to deal with one who must be convinced with arguments that in this passage Christ is openly called God. He undoubtedly will ask whether whenever in the Sacred Scriptures God is said to be with this or that person it must be understood that the substance or nature of God is in some extraordinary way with them, since according to his nature he is not more in one place than in another, for he is within no place nor outside of any place. But when in hundreds of passages God is said to be with certain persons, we understand that the favour and help of God is present. As, according to the language of Sacred Scripture, which in a certain human fashion speaks to us, we are said to withdraw from God whenever we neglect his precepts, so he is said to withdraw from us whenever he ceases to be propitious and well-disposed toward us. And since this quality of language is commonplace throughout the mystical books,[43] what compels us to interpret it otherwise?

This is the way Jerome[44] and Augustine[45] interpret it, he says. So be it. I shall also add Tertullian,[46] who is in my opinion no less learned than either of them. Their authority does not bring it about that the appellation is self-evident. I call it an appellation since in place of a cognomen the word God is added to it or is placed before it as a praenomen just as the word God is usually placed alongside the Father and the word Lord is placed before the Son. And this is done openly, since there is no hesitation. This cannot be said in the present instance. For it is not self-evident simply because they so interpret it. On the contrary, if the language did not have any obscurity, it would not need interpretation. In the second place, it cannot be denied, according to the historical sense of this passage that it is so construed that we understand that God is with his people because he freed them from two kings. For so

* * * * *

41 Matt 1:23

42 Erasmus had previously discussed this passage in his apology refuting Zúñiga, who had argued that 'Emmanuel' was an indication of Christ's divinity, *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 126:343–52, above, p 57.

43 Erasmus here refers to books in the Old Testament in which according to allegorical interpretation Christ is speaking or referred to.

44 Jerome *Comm in Isaiam* 3, at Isa 7:14–15 CCL 73 104–5

45 Ps Augustine *Altercatio ecclesiae et synagogae* 9 PL 42 1117–30

46 Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.12 CCL 1 523–4

writes Jerome: 'O house of David, let him now be called by you Emmanuel, that is, God with us, for you will experience from the facts themselves that having been liberated from two enemy kings you have God present helping you. And he who will afterwards be called Jesus, that is, Saviour, since he will save all mankind, will now be called by you by the name Emmanuel.'[47] You see what explanation Jerome gives of the name, according to the historical sense. The virgin birth indicates the quickness of bringing salvation. The name of the boy signifies that the aid of the propitious deity will be present.

The same reasoning exists in the allegorical sense. At his birth Jesus is called Emmanuel because through him God declared that he is truly propitious to the race of mortals, while through his Son he offered eternal salvation to all by freeing them from the tyranny of the devil. The leader, he will say, who at that time liberated the people of Israel from the two kings, was not God, but Christ, who was prefigured, was to be truly God. But words do not immediately explain what this is. And it is possible that the prophet sensed it, as some interpret, but made clear what he sensed obscurely. And I do not know whether it has been fully understood by anyone before this became clear through the preaching of the gospel. Certainly it cannot be denied that words are ambiguous and that meaning occurs very frequently in arcane books, which reveals the favour of a propitious deity, not its nature.

Finally, if we insist on allegory, the special property of allegory is to contain some obscurity; if used in a historical sense, it will not even be certain if it applies to Christ. He was never called Emmanuel, but Jesus. And from this Marcion, judaizing, took the opportunity of his madness to say that our Christ was not the one whom the prophet had promised, because the name was not suitable, since the one was called Jesus, while the other had to be called Emmanuel. Tertullian refuted them, saying that it was the reality in Christ that mattered, not the word itself. He brought salvation, and he was God, and he reconciled God the Father to us. Similarly, with a certain religious feeling names were bestowed among the Hebrews, not always to signify the nature of the boy, but the event or a distinguishing quality.

For Isaac was not so-called because he was laughed at from his nature, but because when the angel promised offspring to an old woman, she laughed because she did not believe it.[48] Cain was not given that name

* * * * *

47 See n42 above.

48 Gen 18:12–15. Abraham had laughed also in disbelief that Sarah could give birth to a child in her old age, Gen 17:17. the name Isaac means 'he who laughs' in Hebrew.

because it was a possession by nature,[49] but because when he was born Eve began to have her first son. So Hosea gave the name Israel to the first son whom he had from his whorish wife, because in the valley of Israel the Lord would conquer Jerusalem, not because his son, who was called by the name valley, was a valley.[50] In addition, the name 'not pitied' was given to the daughter born of her.[51] And the name 'not my people' was given to a son who was born.[52] It is plainly evident here that in the words given as names their nature is not indicated, but the will of the deity toward his people.

Since this is the way things are, see, reader, how much importance Carranza's syllogism has. He says that my interpretation is not valid because it was not said 'It was Emmanuel,' but 'his name will be called Emmanuel.'[53] In my opinion, it would have been better for him, if it had been written 'There will be a boy Emmanuel,' especially since it is beyond question that this name was not given to Jesus. He argues in this way: 'Therefore, was that prophesy true or false?' 'Not false,' etc. Therefore, 'if it is true, the name of the son will be Emmanuel, that is, God with us. It follows, therefore, that the name of God is openly attributed to Christ in that passage,' etc. And he who argues with me about this kind of *epicherema*[54] laments my misfortune that I did not learn dialectic in the Sorbonne. And yet we also saw the Sorbonne,[55] if it makes you a dialectician, and long ago as a boy we learned dialectic.

What I had added in passing is merely superfluous: even if we concede that here Christ is openly called God, this does not altogether contradict us, who have spoken about evangelical and apostolic words which they use speaking of Christ, not those which they use to recite other things. Sancho seriously tries to convince me that this testimony of the prophet has more importance because it is spoken by Luke, to such a degree that he who does not accept it must be considered a heretic and damned together with the Manicheans.[56] Otherwise, he says, neither what is cited in the Acts of the

* * * * *

49 The name Cain of itself means 'acquired' or 'possession.'
50 Hos 1:3–5
51 Hos 1:6. Her name in Hebrew was Lo-ruhamah.
52 Hos 1:9. His name in Hebrew was Loammi.
53 Isa 7:14
54 In Aristotle's use, an attempted proof that is not conclusive.
55 Erasmus attended the University of Paris from 1495 to 1499. Carranza also studied in Paris at about the same time.
56 Manichaeism is a dualistic religion based on a struggle between good and evil, a spiritual world of light and a material world of darkness. It was the main rival of Christianity for many centuries beginning in the third century.

Apostles, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive,'[57] since it is not found in the books of the Old Testament, will have any importance if no authority accrues to it from the authority of Luke.

When he had driven this home with a flood of hateful words, he sums up with these words: 'Therefore Erasmus is proven wrong in asserting that the truth is supported by the testimony of Luke.' With syllogisms of this sort theologians in Rome defend the Catholic faith. I ask you, how is Erasmus proven wrong, who never doubted, but ingenuously admitted and continues to admit that this prophecy of Isaiah is true and rightly adapted to Christ through the authority of the evangelist? Who is so insane that he does not accept this? But this is what was involved, whether in this testimony Christ was openly called God, even if it is generally admitted that he was God and man,[58] and whether they can properly be called apostolic letters if they recall certain things from the volumes of the Old Testament. This should have been taught to Sancho if he had wished to be of service to his friend Zúñiga.

Then again because I had added that Jerome does not openly say what Zúñiga twists into a different meaning, my critic finds my 'keen-sighted diligence'[59] lacking since in a previous passage he openly asserts that the child was to be called Emmanuel. And what is more, we have already taught that the appellation is not simply attributed to Christ, since he was never called by that name, but was called Jesus; and this name was bestowed on the child who was then about to be born, at whose birth the people would be liberated from the tyranny of two kings, or, as others explain, to the second of the sons of Isaiah,[60] a boy who certainly was not the Son of God, but, as Jerome explains at this point, by his name declared that God would be well-disposed toward his people. And applying the prophecy to Christ, he said: 'And he who afterwards will be called Jesus, that is, Saviour, because he is destined to save the whole human race, shall now be called Emmanuel by you.'[61] But why, Jerome? Evidently because now God will be truly propitious or rather, present through his Son, freeing us from the servitude of that cruellest of tyrants, the devil. Jerome comes closer to the truth when he somewhat later adds: 'You will not marvel at the novelty of the event if a virgin brings forth

* * * * *

57 Acts 20:35
58 As in the Athanasian Creed 28
59 A phrase used by Carranza
60 Jerome *Comm in Isa* 3 7:14–15 CCL 73 105; Jerome notes that someone contended that Isa had two sons, Jasub and Emmanuel.
61 Ibid.

God.'[62] These things are rightly said owing to the knowledge and reliability of Jerome as coming from a commentator. Yet he does not openly affirm that from the name of Emmanuel Christ is called God. And if he were to say this, his authority would not remove the ambiguity of prophetic language, which belongs to the subject now being treated.

Concerning Zúñiga's contention that Christ is called the Son of God in many places I answered that Christ himself taught that pious men were not only called the sons of God, but even gods.[63] 'I said: "You are gods and children of the Most High, all of you;"'[64] From this it is plain that anyone who is called the son of God cannot immediately be God according to nature. So we read in the tenth chapter of John: '"I and the Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones to stone him. Jesus answered them: "I have shown you many good works from the Father. For which of these do you stone me?" The Jews answered him: "We do not stone you for a good work but for blasphemy, for though you are a man you make yourself God." Jesus answered them: "Is it not written in your law, 'I said you are gods?' If those to whom the word came were gods, and Scripture cannot be annulled, do you say that the one whom God sanctified and sent into the world blasphemes because I said "I am the Son of God?"'[65] I said that it does not immediately follow as a consequence that one who calls himself the son of God is the Son of God according to nature. And I have as a defender of these words John the Evangelist, and I myself. Therefore Sancho should have dealt with them if he had wanted to refute me.

But ignoring what was the main point of the argument, let us expand the discussion into a much wider perspective, fighting against the Arians with every kind of weapon and striving to prove that Christ was the Son of God according to nature, making use, if it pleases the gods, also of the auxiliary forces of Aristotle, who wrote that like begets like.[66] As if no one would believe this unless such a great authority had intervened, although sometimes against Aristotle's will an ass gives birth to a mule – or as if comparisons drawn from our experience correspond exactly to divine concerns.

* * * * *

62 Ibid.
63 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 126:353–6, p 57 above.
64 Ps 82:6
65 John 10:30–6
66 Aristotle *De anima* 2.4 415a26: 'The most natural act is the production of another like itself, ie in order that, as far as its nature allows, it may partake in the eternal and the divine.'

He also introduces the authority of the Jews, who understood that he said he was the Son of God according to nature and that he made himself equal to God.[67] Likewise Carranza cites the authority of Caiaphas, who as soon as Christ was asked if he were the Son, immediately cried out 'Blasphemy!' and rent his garments.[68] The same for the Pharisees, who, as he hung upon the cross, reproached him for saying that he was the Son of God.[69] Sancho collects a great many other things that support this opinion which, since they do not pertain to me, I will neither continue to mention nor attempt to refute. For why should I refute things with which I agree? That Sancho continually repeats that from his findings we can determine that the Son of God existed in a particular way I am in complete agreement. Furthermore what is adduced must necessarily be adduced by proofs. But it is not at all certain to what these proofs are to be applied.

Nor is it only from this surname that the pious infer what the Jews concluded with the malicious intent to accuse him falsely, since Christ wished to indicate his divine nature by deeds rather than words, knowing that at that time the apostles would not have believed it if he had openly preached that he was God according to nature. For when Peter states openly that he is 'the Son of the living God,'[70] although he said it through the inspiration of the Father, nevertheless it is not credible that at that time he believed with complete faith that Jesus was the Son of God according to nature and of the same essence with him. But because Christ performed things beyond human strength; because he said many things with an authority that he had not received from men;[71] because he always had God the Father on his tongue although the Jews gloried in their father Abraham,[72] before whom he said he was and is;[73] because he often said that he had been sent by God and performed the works of his Father,[74] while they did the works of their father, the devil;[75] because he said he was one with the Father, although the

* * * * *

67 'For this reason the Jews were seeking all the more to kill him because he was not only breaking the sabbath, but was also calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God.' John 5:18
68 Matt 26:65
69 Matt 27:41–3
70 Matt 16:16
71 John 5:41
72 John 8:39
73 John 8:58
74 Repeatedly in John, eg John 5:36–7
75 John 8:41

ancients interpret this from a consensus of works;[76] because he promised that it would come to pass that one day they would see 'the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power.'[77] From these things, I say, and many others the Jews falsely accused him of speaking about his Father in an unusual manner although he knew nothing of Joseph nor of Abraham, especially although even in the sacred writings the prophets were called the sons of God,[78] yet no one ever called himself God or the Son of God, but rather they call themselves servants of God. From these things, combined together, especially from the resurrection, the apostles knew perfectly that he was God and the Son of God, not only according to grace but also according to nature.

Sancho is greatly pleased by this argument, that Christ was not simply called the Son of God by Peter, but 'the Son of the living God.'[79] And when questioned before the high priest he confesses himself to be 'the Son of the blessed God.'[80] Whenever the word 'living' is added in the writings of the New Testament, nature is to be understood, not adoption.[81] And if in the passage of Hosea just mentioned[82] those who were not sons of God except by adoption are called 'the sons of the living God,' what forbids us from calling in as many words those that were called pious after the advent of Christ, especially when Peter still knew his Judaism and the high priest Caiaphas knew nothing about this difference? There was no reason therefore why Sancho should fear that an opportunity should be given to 'Arian, born long ago,' as he said, or 'to be born in the future,' or that he should gravely warn me not to turn a blind eye, but rather to lift up 'the eyes of the mind';[83] or that he should say that these arguments are introduced in criticism of an annotation of Erasmus although neither am I opposed to the opinion of the

* * * * *

76 John 10:30, 'The Father and I are one.' Erasmus interprets this passage in the sense of a functional unity of the Father and the Son, not a unity in essence although certain church fathers took it as a testimony of the equality of the Father and the Son.

77 Luke 21:27

78 This is not the usual designation of prophets, but is reserved for righteous and pious persons.

79 Matt 16:16, Mark 8:29

80 Matt 14:61–2

81 This may refer to the sect of the Ebionites, who assumed that Christ was adopted by the Father at his baptism.

82 Hos 1:10

83 The usual expression is 'the mind's eye,' a phrase first used by Plato to signify the faculty of man to perceive what is real as against things seen by the bodily eye. Erasmus often uses this expression.

church, nor do these accusations have any effect against my annotation. We are amply persuaded that Jesus Christ is truly and according to nature God and man, to whom be praise and glory for eternal ages. Amen.

John 1. 'And the word was God.'[84]

Sancho acts similarly in the second passage. In many words he asserts that from this passage it is taught that Christ was God. But what is the purpose of teaching this, which we already know and accept as true? Only this should have been taught, that here the cognomen of God is openly attributed to Christ. And yet this is not altogether denied by me. On the contrary, I generously acknowledge that this is the one passage in which Christ is called God. For I write as follows: 'It seems to me to be more certainly inferred than by a manifest appellation.'[85] And I add a rational explanation, which when employed one is persuaded that here Christ is called God.[86] I did not insert this brief preface to avoid suspicion of impiety, but to block the path of calumny to sycophants, with whom now everything is full on all sides.

Sancho so deals with me as if I deny that Christ is openly called God because it is written 'God was the word,'[87] not God was Christ. I am not in the habit of sophisticating so childishly. In the meantime I will not examine whether Christ is a word of complete hypostasis.[88] Certainly Tertullian assumes that it is a word of a man who is not anointed with grace except according to nature.[89]

Nor does this matter which Sancho dragged in pertain to this passage. This much is beyond controversy, that in this passage John is discussing the divine nature of the Son of God, who, he teaches, was born of the Father before the beginning of all things, more precisely, without beginning, and was God. And yet he had not yet assumed human nature, which had not yet been created. But he who was always God later became man. At this point the crass mind of man could imagine that the Son ceased to be God after he became man. But by a process of reasoning there is a counter argument to this opinion: the divine nature is immutable. Therefore the Son so assumed human nature that nonetheless he remained what he was. It follows, therefore,

* * * * *

84 John 1:1
85 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 126:360–1, above, p 57.
86 Ibid. 126:361–5
87 John 1:1
88 Hypostasis is a technical term in theology used to designate the individual reality or person of the Trinity, in particular, the single person of Christ.
89 Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.15.6 CCL 1 528

that the same person was God and man, both natures perfectly joined together in the same hypostasis. You see, therefore, that some reasoning was necessary here so that from that which preceded, 'God was the word,' and from that which follows, 'and the word was made flesh,'[90] one may deduce that the same Jesus Christ was of both natures. Sancho continues and teaches that Augustine, whom a little earlier – I know not what he was thinking – he called a breeder of heresies, convinced the Arians with this passage. Why should he not do so, if in fact the Arians deny that Christ was God? And I myself confess that it can be deduced from this with indisputable reasoning. But again Sancho rises up: 'But Augustine does not say in this passage that the divinity of Christ is certainly inferred, but that this passage is a very clear testimony by which those who deny that Christ is God are proven wrong.' What is it I hear? Can it be that a passage which is proven wrong with indisputable proof is not a testimony? Or can it not be called a testimony unless it has a clear appellation?

As for the rest of what Sancho brings forward from Chrysostom,[91] how Christ was not immediately proclaimed as God and with what words and what deeds his divinity became known, although they are rightly spoken, since they do not pertain to me, I will not discuss them. But at the same time I do not hear anything that is relevant to opposing my annotation, about which, nevertheless, Sancho speaks, nor is there anything that supports Zúñiga, whom he undertook to defend.

John 20. 'My Lord and my God.'[92]

At this point since I had said superfluously: 'Here anyone could hesitate,'[93] Sancho charges me with vacillation, since I admit that this passage is one out of two or three.[94] Not content with this, he adds, 'As Erasmus asserts incorrectly.' Does he who rejects another's vacillation make allegations

* * * * *

90 John 1:14

91 Carranza gives a list, borrowed from Chrysostom, of sayings and acts of Jesus through which he gradually revealed his divinity.

92 John 20:28

93 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 126:368, p 58 above.

94 Ibid. 369–70. In the *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516 at John 1:1 Erasmus had remarked that the name of God was attributed to Christ only two or three times. Zúñiga replied by adducing ten such passages but Erasmus argued forcefully that they were disputable. Carranza attempted to defend his friend's contentions but Erasmus, of course, maintained his objections.

of his own? In addition, he could not name theologians without adding 'whom Erasmus for no reason calls coarse and uncouth?' Likewise in his preface, when he makes mention of the theological arena, he adds: 'which Erasmus several times calls thorny.' And again he said: 'of our theologians, whom he is accustomed to call theologasters.' I certainly do not call at random any theologians at all by that name. That I happened to use such a term speaking of certain individuals, who grow old using clever rather than necessary conundrums, certainly this passage did not require it to be manipulated again, unless, as I suspect, someone like Zúñiga has adulterated it. For I do not want to be suspicious of Sancho, the Alcalá theologian.

Last of all, to this little discussion he adds a genial colophon: 'In his second response Erasmus offers grass to Zúñiga.'[95] What is left therefore but that an ovation be declared for Zúñiga, the victor? I testified that there were three passages, that is, few, and one I grant to Zúñiga. What, therefore, did Zúñiga win? He defeats nothing, unless he won a fourth passage. And yet here too he did not want to be clever, lest he give scandal to the weak.

Acts Chapter 20. 'To rule the church of God, which he obtained with his blood!'[96]

Here our friend Sancho, virtually forgetting the theological personage that he assumed, having become more arrogant at his success, begins to become more uninhibited and taunt me with jibes. When I had pointed out a double interpretation by which one could equivocate (for I called it by its real name, concerning which there is no equivocation), Sancho likewise acts as if I wish to equivocate. And this charming fellow surprisingly laughs at me, who would believe that the name of Jesus Christ could be traced back to previous names, as if the books of the New Testament do not abound here and there with transpositions of words of this sort, in which Origen and Jerome often exert themselves tirelessly, especially when for other reasons in close proximity to the word God 'and Jesus Christ' is understood. For these are the words of Luke: 'If only I may finish my course and the ministry of the word that I received from the Lord Jesus to testify to the good news of God's grace. And now I know that none of you among whom I have gone about proclaiming the kingdom of God will ever see my face again. Therefore I declare to you this day that I am not responsible for the blood of any of you for I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole purpose of God. Keep watch

* * * * *

95 To offer grass to an enemy is to admit defeat.
96 Acts 20:28

over yourselves and over all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers to watch the church of God, which he obtained by his blood.'[97]

And nevertheless, whatever this is, if I had considered it of great importance, I would not have read it out loud as a superfluous equivocation. So then there is no reason why Sancho should mention calumny. For who is being denounced here or against whom is a false charge being made? Except that I suspect that Sancho is more familiar with the act of calumny rather than with the word, since he thinks there is no difference between calumny and mere quibbling.

Tertullian, a man certainly not to be less regarded than any of the ancients in the knowledge of Sacred Scripture, teaches us that every time there is mention of the Father and the Son conjointly, the name of God is attributed to the Father, to the Son not the name of God, but of Lord.[98] But the Son is also called God whenever there is mention of him separately, and yet in this passage when he was speaking of the Son previously: 'which I received from the Lord Jesus,'[99] he adds concerning the Father, 'to testify to the good news of God's grace'[100] and again 'among whom I have gone about proclaiming the kingdom of God.'[101] And again 'so as not to keep you from knowing the whole purpose of God.'[102] 'And later 'to watch over the church of God that he obtained with his own blood.'[103] Certainly according to the rule of Tertullian the name of God is not placed here altogether separately, since 'Son' with his title preceded it.

But Sancho, content to have made fun of the equivocation and to have called it 'a calumny,' moves on to another equivocation in which, not free from qualifications, he reveals a danger, namely, that we do not fall into the pit of the Noetians, Patripassians, and Sabellians.[104] There will be no danger

* * * * *

97 Acts 20:24–8
98 Tertullian *Adversus Praxean* 3.9
99 Acts 20:24
100 Ibid.
101 Acts 20:25
102 Acts 20:27
103 Acts 20:28
104 These three sects formed a Christian movement in the second and third centuries called Monarchianism, which emphasized that God was one, thus denying the Trinity. Noetus taught in Smyrna at the end of the second century. He rejected the distinction of persons in God and taught Patripassianism which denied that the Logos, Jesus, possessed subsistence. It was God the Father who suffered and died, as the name of the sect, coined by Tertullian, indicates. Sabellianism was the belief that the three persons of the Trinity are three different modes or

as long as the church will have such cautious theologians. What danger is there, I ask you, since in Paul the Father is called *servator* and *redemptor*,[105] because he redeemed us through the Son, if he calls the blood shed by the Son on the altar of the cross his to this degree that he handed him over to death for us. And let it not be said that for that reason those absurdities follow as a consequence: 'that the Father took on flesh from a virgin,' that he died, 'that he rose again.'[106] No more than if one speaking of a slaughtered sheep should say: 'I slaughtered my flesh in vain,' if perhaps, he had not offered it in atonement. Or will it immediately follow that he himself was an immolated sheep? Would it not therefore be absurd if the Father would call that victim whom he himself supplied, that price with which he redeemed the human race through his Son, his price or his victim or his blood?

And at this point our dear teacher bids me to be diligently attentive as he recites a passage from Ambrose against certain heretics[107] of whom some said that the divinity suffered, others deprived Christ of human nature, preaching that he was only God. Why does he sing me this refrain?[108] Yet in the end Sancho does not disapprove the meaning that I put forward. But he says that it must not be permitted that an orthodox person should agree in terminology with heretics. But we agree with the Origenists in the resurrection of the body.[109] And I do not think it is clear to him what words were used by the heretics he introduces.

But of what importance is it to prattle about this matter? It is not a question whether this passage calls Christ God, but whether it calls him such so that for someone who is not convinced there is no subterfuge. It is more acceptable to me how the name of God here refers to Christ, who if he had been called God at least in one passage in these writings whose authority is infrangible in our eyes, it would suffice in the fullest sense for us.

* * * * *

manifestations of God rather than three distinct persons within the Godhead. The heresy is attributed to a certain Sabellius, who is said to have taught this doctrine in Rome in the early second century.

105 These titles of Christ are never used in the Vulgate, but rather the word *salvator* to translate *σωτήρ* (Saviour) in 1 Tim 1:1; 2:3; 4:10 and in Titus 1:3; 2:10 and 3:4. Erasmus in the 1516 edition of his *Novum Instrumentum* translated the Greek as *servator,* but changed it to *salvator* in all the other editions.

106 These absurdities were used by Carranza.

107 Ambrose *De fide ad Gratianum* 3.5.38 CSEL 78 121:27–30

108 *Adagia* II v 76

109 Origen denied the identity of the mortal body with the resurrected body, believing that the resurrection of the dead is spiritual, not of the flesh. Paul discusses this at some length in 1 Cor 15:35–55.

Romans Chapter 9.[110] **'From whom according to the flesh comes the Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever.'**

At this point Sancho suddenly cuts my throat with my own sword, as David did to Goliath.[111] I barely restrained my laughter when I read that from a puny little man I was suddenly turned into a Polyphemus.[112] But it is worthwhile to hear how he slaughters me. In explaining this passage in a paraphrase, I openly apply the words 'blessed God' to Christ.[113] It is extraordinary if I so interpret them as I see how all the ancient writers interpreted them with a great consensus. And it is extraordinary if I follow the opinion that I most favour. But let Sancho respond to me whether the expression can be so punctuated as I indicate or not.[114] If it cannot, let him explain why it cannot. If it can, there will not be lacking someone who could use equivocation. This is no different than the discussion between me and Zúñiga.

Augustine says: 'Nowhere is there mention of the father's name, and therefore if it is denied that it is said of Christ, let the person be named whom it befits.'[115] But for the time being from these and other words of Augustine it may be conjectured that there were not lacking at that time those who interpreted this passage as referring to the Father. But this stands in the way, that there is no mention of the Father there, but of the Son. But if it permits another distinction, there will be nothing to prevent its being said of the Father, who is often called God without qualification.

I will add this also: let the reader consider whether the name of God, which is repeated more than once in this passage, is so placed that it may signify not one person specifically, but comprehend the whole Trinity, and God is said to have acquired the church by his own blood (for in Greek the word is

* * * * *

110 Rom 9:5

111 1 Sam 17:51

112 The giant or Cyclops blinded by Odysseus, Homer *Odyssey* 9.214–15; 256–7

113 CWE 42 53 and 153 n2. He had already given this interpretation in the *Novum Instrumentum* (1516), although in the note to that passage he indicated that if a comma were placed after the word 'omnia' the following phrase could constitute a doxology to God the Father, as often in the New Testament, but disavowed it because there was such great agreement among all the witnesses that it referred to Christ. See the long discussion on this passage by Robert Sider in *Annotations of Romans* CWE 56 242–52

114 In the *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 128:384–6, p 59 above, Erasmus had suggested that it was possible to put a full stop after *qui est super omnia* and to read *Deus benedictus in saecula* as an independent clause.

115 Ps Augustine *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* 127.91.8 CSEL 50 157:15–16

ἰδίου 'one's own'), just as one is said to sustain a burden by his body,[116] since he does not do this with his eyes or his ears; or if the mind is said to grasp many things although the force of memory properly accomplishes it.

But in the meantime, you will say, this is not a satisfactory explanation unless Christ is called God in this passage. I agree, for I state this for no other reason than to explain what offends the reader in this passage.

From the epistle to the Philippians, chapter 2.
'But he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave,'[117] etc.

Although Ambrose interpreted this passage in various ways,[118] but with more emphasis on this part so that he interpreted the form of God[119] as an example and outward appearance of divinity, that is, the miracles by which he declared that his nature was divine, while the form of a servant[120] was the outward appearance of a guilty man, in which he was scourged, condemned and crucified, and although I mentioned this in two words in my response to Zúñiga, nevertheless Sancho ignores this and likewise disputes it as if he wishes to persuade me that Christ is God, which is accepted as unquestionably true by all Christians.

Paul at this point proposes the example of modesty: Christ did not claim equality with God but cast himself down, playing the part of a servant, and of a guilty servant, when he was scourged and crucified. But from this, you will say, it is inferred that he was equal to God. On the other hand, what praise of modesty was it not to claim for himself what he did not have? I do not deny that this is rightly and truly inferred. But where there is an inference there is a ratiocination. My annotation spoke of 'a cognomen openly attributed,'[121] that is, following the habitual practice of the language of the apostles. Frequently you hear in Paul 'from God the Father,'[122] frequently 'God,' used without qualification for Father. But you often see the cognomen 'Lord' attributed to the Son, not to God, except in a few places. Here,

* * * * *

116 De Jonge deftly points out that in this clause Erasmus, forgetting that he was discussing Rom 9:5, reverted to Acts 20:28, or else, he conjectures, it was added later and inserted in the wrong place.
117 Phil 2:7
118 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7–8 CSEL 81.3 142
119 Quoted from Phil 2:6
120 Quoted from Phil 2:7 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 128:388–9, p 59 above
121 *Novum Instrumentum, Annot* at John 1:1
122 Eg Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3

therefore, even if the passage is free of every doubt, it still cannot be called an appellation.

Next, if it cannot be interpreted in any other way than certain critics of the Arians interpret it, let St Ambrose answer for me, who interprets it otherwise.[123] I do not contend against the divinity of Christ but I repel calumny from my little annotations.

But let us grant that it is an appellation and let us grant that it is openly acknowledged that Christ is said to be declared equal to God the Father, as far as the form of speech is concerned, but to prove that it is incredible there will be need of argumentation. He will answer that equal means not those who are equal in everything but those who are equal in something. 'Equals with equals are very easily joined together.'[124] Those who are equal in age are called equal, although in other things they are unequal. Bishops among themselves and archbishops among themselves are equal, but not in everything. Thus the Son is said to be equal to the Father to the extent that he is God, although he is not equal in everything. To this it will be responded that the divine nature is something very singular, to which nothing extraneous can happen from which inequality can arise. Accordingly, whoever God is, it is proper that he be of the same nature, in no part unlike him with whom he has an individual nature and invariable communality. Therefore, in order that the passage be suitable to prove equality, you see the argumentation provided. I for my part so often admit that there are numerous passages wherein it is taught that Christ was truly God, but I have said that this was not the manner of speaking of the apostles to call him God frequently in their writings although they very often attribute this name to the Father.

But now let us hear something new that Sancho teaches us. 'There is a passage,' he said, 'in the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, chapter two,' which even escaped Zúñiga, a very keen-sighted man long acquainted with the sacred texts, and before he was born, in which Christ is openly called God: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God and our Father, who loved us and gave us consolation.'[125] Sancho claims that this letter cannot be interpreted, unless everything is applied to Christ, that he be called Lord, Father, and God in this passage. So argues the very perceptive Alcalá theologian Sancho. I shall not hesitate to examine his words with all their florid rhetoric. 'If you wish to challenge the meaning of God the Father then, tell me, I

* * * * *

123 See n118.
124 *Adagia* I ii 20
125 2 Thess 2:16

beseech you, what will "Our Father" mean, which is added later? Not God the Father because that would be a useless repetition, nor Christ, because mention of him was made in the first place. Therefore it must be said that all of those things refer to Christ, because he is our Lord, because he is our God, because he is our Father.' Thus far Sancho.

I for my part would like to ask him in turn when in the Apostles' Creed God the Father is named, since he is almighty and the creator of the world, of what importance was it to repeat these things since the name God the Father included all those titles? At the same time I grant that the name Father was added so that he would be distinguished from the other persons. Of course, whenever we say God, we include many things, and yet we explain it for the sake of teaching. Thus he is called God here inasmuch as he is also the God of Christ and the author 'of all deity,' as Augustine says.[126] He adds 'Our Father,' because as he loved the Son, so through him he also loves us.

But the intervening conjunction offends Sancho: 'God and Father,' not 'God the Father,' although in Ambrose the conjunction is not added, but it is added by the Greeks, with whom the same inconvenience of speech does not exist.[127] For they read: 'Both our God and Father,' that is, 'he who is our God and Father,' so that the name Father and the name God refer to the same person. It would be different if he had said 'Our God and Father.' Then it would have seemed to indicate different persons, God and Father.

By now either I am quite stupid or Sancho is not consistent in his argumentation. Although he says that the words 'and the Father' cannot refer to the Son, of whom mention was made a little earlier, he then asserts that everything refers to the Son. But it is best not to engage in sophistries with this clever man.

I am utterly astonished that it escaped the notice of Sancho that Ambrose openly interprets these words to refer to God the Father: 'Since the Father,' he said, 'and the Son are one virtue and one divinity and substance, and therefore he did not hesitate to call him first our Lord Jesus Christ, then God our Father,'[128] etc. And the *Ordinary Gloss* does not interpret it otherwise: 'God,' it says, 'is "power" in that he is the "creator" of all things.'[129] The Father through the affection of charity loved us, sending his Son in our behalf; he

* * * * *

126 Augustine *De Trinitate* 4.20.29 CCL 50.1 200:121–2

127 This is true for the majority of the Greek mss. and for the Greek text in Erasmus' editions of the New Testament.

128 Ambrosiaster at 2 Thess 2:16 CSEL 81.3 243:13–16

129 *Glossa Ordinaria* IV 403

gave us consolation for the miseries of this world. Nor does any other interpreter have any misgiving about this passage, which makes me wonder all the more that a man of such incredible learning could put such nonsense before us with a supercilious look on his face. I wonder that in introducing this citation from Ambrose Sancho does not see in the words of Ambrose that nothing else is taught than the concordant will and mutual cooperation of the Father and the Son. For these are the words of Ambrose that Sancho cites: 'Therefore, that you may know that he is the Father and he is the Son, and there is one work of the Father and the Son, follow the Apostle, who said "He is our Lord Jesus Christ, both God and our Father,"' etc.[130] Ambrose teaches from this passage that there is a distinction of persons, not a plurality of gods, and that they are so distinguished in character that they have the same nature, the same will and the same activity. But if we follow the interpretation of Sancho, this passage will contribute nothing to that which Ambrose strives to prove. I will pardon Sancho for this negligence provided that he in turn will reasonably put up with the lapses of others and will not repeat so often, when there is no need, in his irrelevant discussions against heretics,[131] 'Let Erasmus take heed.' Otherwise I will say in turn: 'Let Sancho open his eyes, since here certainly he had neither eyes nor ears.'

There is still one scruple remaining, that he placed the Son over the Father. The sequence of words demanded this: 'so that you may obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.'[132] He repeats this later: 'He,' that is, 'the same Lord'[133] of whom I have just spoken.

To the Colossians, chapter 2. 'And not according to Christ, for in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily.'[134]

I wonder why it seemed right to Sancho to repeat my words with his constantly since no one could be briefer than I, unless perhaps he wished to be more elegant. Although here too I feel the absence of the man's sincerity. 'Erasmus,' he said, 'repeats again and again in this passage whatever Athanasius says, as cited by Zúñiga,' etc. But in my answer to Zúñiga there

* * * * *

130 Ambrose *De fide ad Gratianum* 2.10.87 CSEL 78 88:19–22

131 Erasmus uses the adage 'Extra oleas' (Beyond the olive trees) *Adagia* II ii 10, which means 'overstepping the bounds.'

132 2 Thess 2:14

133 2 Thess 2:16

134 Col 2:8–9

is no mention of Athanasius, although I have already informed him many times that it is a work of Theophylact, not Athanasius.[135] I merely point out that there is another interpretation, which I enumerate, because in Christ everything exists in great abundance, not partially as in other holy things, not in foreshadowing manner, as in the Mosaic law, but corporeally, that is, truly, perfectly, effectively. And in fact Ambrose does not pass over this interpretation,[136] and Bede drives it home diligently, deriving it no doubt from the ancient writers.[137] And not even the *Gloss*, which it has seemed proper to call *Ordinary*,[138] because I think it has no order, rejects this interpretation. It is a concoction and a cento carelessly patched together from fragments of diverse authors with no titles added. Thomas also mentions it briefly, but rather obscurely, following Theophylact[139] in a rather careless translation. For it seems to have been translated before someone else[140] translated it, apparently more recently.

Although it by no means escaped my attention that certain individuals arm themselves with the testimony of this verse against heretics who denied that Christ was God, nevertheless Paul's interpretation, which we indicated, seems true and genuine. Almost the whole epistle discusses this so that he can entice people away from confidence in the Mosaic law and worldly philosophy, teaching that universal authority, power and favour was given to Christ so that there is nothing to be sought elsewhere since everything is in this one source. Concerning power and dignity he says that Christ is the 'image of God,' who cannot be seen,[141] that through him all things were created, celestial and terrestrial, 'visible and invisible,'[142] that he is the 'firstborn' and the 'beginning' of all creation, that he is 'the head of the body,'[143] that he

* * * * *

135 See n18 above on Theophylact.
136 Ambrosiaster at Col 2:9 CSEL 81.3 182:20–183:3
137 The work referred to is Florus Diaconus of Lyon *Expositio in Epistolas beati Pauli, ex operibus Sancti Augustini collecta* PL 119 391, but this passage is omitted there. Henk Jan de Jonge found it in an edition of Bede, Cologne 1563, tome 6, col. 901. The excerpt from Augustine is from his *Enarratio in Ps 67* PL 36 328A.
138 *Biblia Latina cum glossa ordinaria* (Strasbourg, 1480–1481), repr. Turnhout, 1993, 4 vols. vol. IV 391. On Erasmus' opinion of the work as a chaotic compilation see Henk Jan de Jonge, 'Erasmus und die Glossa Ordinaria zum Neuen Testament' *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 56 (1975) 51–77, esp. 67–8.
139 Theophylact *Comm in Col* 2:13 PG 124, 1241C
140 Porsena; see n18 above.
141 Col 1:15
142 Col 1:16
143 Col 1:18

is the church. Giving the reason for such great authority, he said, 'because thus it seemed proper to God the Father that all fullness dwell in him.'[144] Certainly, in this passage neither with the Greeks nor with Ambrose is the name divinity added, but only fullness.

Again, summoning us from the teaching of the imperfect law to the perfect law of the gospel he says, 'into all the riches of the fullness of understanding of the knowledge of the mystery of God in Christ, in whom all treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden.'[145] At this point, as if asked by the reader, 'from where do you repeat these words, Paul?' 'I say this,' he said, 'lest anyone deceive you with subtlety of speech.'[146] Why do you run to the pools of water when you have the fount? Why do you love shadows when you have the body itself? Why does the darkness delight you when you have the light? Why do you seek the imperfect from the limbs when all fullness is in the head?

A little later he continues, since this is the case, 'see that no one leads you astray through empty philosophy, through the tradition of men, according to the rudimentary teachings of this world.'[147] Again, as if asked why he does not wish to turn them from Christ to men, he said, 'Because in him all the fullness of divinity lives bodily,'[148] that is, whatever can be imbibed from others, is perpetual in Christ, is completely full in Christ, exists most truly and efficaciously in Christ, and the tenor of what follows corresponds to this meaning. Although it is true that the divine nature dwelt in Christ, and it is probable that it was never separated from his body, nevertheless that does not accord very well with what Paul is discussing here.

Here Sancho objects: of what relevance is it that Paul repeats here what he inculcates in other parts of this letter? On the contrary, this strengthens my argument, for Paul is accustomed to repeat the same thing again and again, if something is dear to him. But he repeats, inculcates and impresses nothing more frequently than that they should not place their confidence in the Mosaic law, as if anything were lacking to Christ.

Let us now make each meaning equal to the other; yet it cannot be denied that the meaning is twofold among the orthodox. The passage is obscure inasmuch as so many men hesitate.

* * * * *

144 Col 1:19
145 Col 2:2–3
146 Col 2:4
147 Col 2:8
148 Col 2:9

Finally, pretend that the passage is so clear that no one could interpret otherwise; yet it cannot be called a clear appellation. For this too would require an interpretation of how divinity dwells there and whether it is God in whomever he inhabits. Certainly it is disputed by the ancients whether the true substance of the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles or some unspecified grace, and whether it was created from something or uncreated. It seems therefore that the divine nature can dwell in someone who is not God.

After these things have been discussed and disputed scholastically and successfully, as if he were worried that someone might doubt that Christ is God unless he teaches that he is so called in a great number of places in the New Testament, Sancho produces testimony from the third chapter of the first epistle to the Thessalonians: 'Now may our God and Father and Lord Jesus himself direct our way to you.'[149] When Sancho had quoted this passage incorrectly in the next chapter,[150] not content with that, he repeats it again according to the proverb *δὶς καὶ τρὶς τὰ καλά* ('beautiful things two or three times').[151] But again in this passage I am compelled to find lacking in the theologian not only diligence but also modesty. For what is more impudent than to introduce a new reading and a new meaning as well against the interpretation of all ancient and recent interpreters, lest Zúñiga have too few passages? Therefore, let Sancho hear what Ambrose writes about this passage: 'He demands that his journey be organized in complete order: first by God the Father because all things are from him; then by the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, so that the power and providence of the Father and the Son will commend his coming,'[152] etc. To what end is it relevant to cite the commentaries of others since no one interprets it differently? And indeed, if anyone wishes to interpret otherwise, the structure of the Greek language would cry out in protest: *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ᾽Ιησοῦς Χριστός*[153] ('He is God and Father of us himself and the Lord of us is Jesus Christ').[154] Evidently the article not added to Father and added to Lord compels us to accept two persons, as we indicated in a similar statement above.

* * * * *

149 1 Thess 3:11
150 Phil 2:6
151 *Adagia* I ii 49
152 Ambrosiaster at 1 Thess 3:11 CSEL 78, 81.3 233:3–6
153 In the first two editions, A and BAS, *ὑμῶν* 'of you' was erroneously printed for *ἡμῶν* 'of us,' a mistake that can easily be made.
154 1 Thess 3:11

But now let us hear, I beseech you, what a serious reason Sancho adduces to forbid me from using evasion. For Sancho is remarkably fond of this word. 'A text cannot,' he said, 'be ordered copulatively, as if Paul wishes to say, "May God himself direct our path to you, and may our Father direct our path to you, and may the Lord Jesus direct our path to you."' Ridiculous! Who would devise such a grammatical order, even if he wished to repeat the verb from a previous section of the sentence. He should rather order it this way, I think: 'May God and the same Father direct and let the Lord Jesus direct. There cannot be two persons, said Sancho, when *dirigat* (singular) follows, not *dirigant* (plural).[155] Let us go therefore to the Areopagite grammarians.[156] May I drop dead if they will judge that the one who wrote this had a brow or a heart. Rather, no grammatical form is more frequent than that an additional element will correspond to the closest subject.

Of the same mental acuteness is also this: he introduces this passage from Ambrose against Gratian to show that the Father and the Son Christ are one God. He says, 'He says Father and he says Son, but it is a unity of direction because it is a unity of power.'[157] Since this statement is very similar to the one above, in which he contended that all things must be referred to the Son, and he is God, he is our Father, he is the Lord Jesus, and since Ambrose cited the passage for the same reason, why does he admit two persons here[158] and does not admit them in the other?[159] For if he did not admit them, the reasoning of Ambrose would not be valid. Since Paul seeks the same thing from both, Ambrose concludes that each has the same power and efficacy. The Lord himself teaches this elsewhere: 'My Father is still working and I am still working.'[160] The reasoning would have held firm, or rather it would have held more firm, if the verb had been in the plural number. Of those who sing the same song it is rightly said, 'They sing,' but if someone were to say 'Peter and Paul sang,'[161] it can be understood that they sang separately.

* * * * *

155 This is a grammatical conundrum. When there are two or more subjects, the verb may agree with all of them or with the one closest to the verb, but if the subjects are persons, the verb usually agrees with all the persons, therefore in the plural.

156 The Areopagites were members of the supreme council of judges in Athens. They were noted for their severity and incorruptibility, *Adagia* I ix 41.

157 Ambrose *De fide ad Gratianum* 2.10 CSEL 78 88:23–4

158 1 Thess 3:11

159 Col 2:9

160 John 5:17

161 In Latin the verb is singular.

And when it is said: 'Peter and Paul hauled the ship,'[162] it is more quickly understood that it is a single hauling than if you say, 'Peter and Paul hauled the ship,'[163] so that the same verb is silently repeated for the individual parts.

But let the word have that meaning; let it be a clear and irrefutable proof of the same divinity, certainly it cannot be called an appellation, concerning which we are at odds. Yet Sancho affirms it. Consider, reader, I beseech you, what kind of critics I have. And books of this kind are being printed and read in Rome with the applause and not without the concern of some people.[164] And several hundreds of this farina, as they say, are promised.[165]

To Titus, chapter 2.[166] 'Of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ.'

Here again my friend Sancho, surpassing himself as he progresses, strives to appear witty and facetious while he betrays nothing other than his impudence. Although it cannot be denied that language among both the Greeks and the Romans can be considered ambiguous, to what end was it necessary to mention here the frigid sophism: 'Pepper is sold both here and in Rome?'[167] Then when I teach that Ambrose so interpreted it,[168] Sancho should either have refuted it or disputed it with him, not with me, who merely make note but assert nothing. Nor was it important to remind us that Jerome explained these things differently, since I myself had attested to it previously in an annotation, not only concerning Jerome, but also Chrysostom and Theophylact.[169] And certainly their interpretation does not displease me, but that does not remove the ambiguity of the language.

* * * * *

162 In Latin the verb is plural.

163 In Latin the verb is again singular.

164 Erasmus learned of Zúñiga's intention to publish his *Blasphemiae et impietates* sometime in the period from February to April 1522 (Ep 1260:159–71, 204–17; Ep 1268:77–82; Ep 1278:6–8). It was published before May, and Erasmus completed his apology against this work not later than 13 June 1522.

165 *Adagia* III v 4

166 Titus 2:13

167 Carranza had written: Pepper is sold both in Paris and Rome.

168 Ambrosiaster at Titus 2:13 CSEL 81.3 330

169 In his annotations on Titus 2:13 in the 1516 and 1519 editions of his New Testament Erasmus mentioned that Chrysostom and Jerome attributed both titles to Christ, and in 1522 he added the name of Theophylact. The passages are Jerome *Comm in Titum* 2:11–14 CCL 77C 53 387–8; Chrysostom *Hom in Titum* 2:13 PG 62 690; Theophylact *Comm in Titum* 2:13 PG 125 164.

That Sancho strongly asserts that in sacred Scripture the coming is attributed only to Christ, while we grant this to him for the time being, though it is not true, let him know that in this passage it is not a *παρουσία*, but an *ἐπιφάνεια*, that is, an apparition or illustration. It does not say the coming of the Father, but the coming of glory.[170] For then the glory of the Father will be manifested in the coming of the Son, when eternal rewards will be given, while in the meantime hidden things will be revealed in pious men, who are harassed and afflicted by the worshippers of this world. But this meaning accords with that which Christ promises elsewhere, that he will come with the majesty of the Father.[171]

But here Sancho finds in passing another passage in this same chapter, in which Christ is manifestly called God. It is: 'so that in everything they may adorn the doctrine of our Saviour.'[172] But he does not attend to explaining this passage that follows: 'for the grace of God, our Saviour, appeared.'[173] Now if this passage is applied to the Father, it follows that the previous passage must also refer to the Father. But Ambrose openly applies it to the Father: 'The gift of God shone upon men through Christ,'[174] etc. Nor did Jerome keep silent about this interpretation,[175] nor does Theophylact dissent.[176] And it is not absurd to say that the doctrine of Christ is called the doctrine of the Father, since he himself says in the gospel: 'My teaching is not mine, but of him who sent me, the Father.'[177] For what Sancho teaches us with authority, that the word 'Saviour' is not attributed to anyone but Christ, is quickly refuted in the next chapter: 'But when the goodness and humanity of God our Saviour appeared.'[178] Certainly it cannot be avoided here that the Father is called Saviour. But if someone should try to distort it to the Son, what follows will immediately refute it: 'Which he poured out on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.'[179] Jerome interprets it no

* * * * *

170 Titus 2:13
171 Luke 9:26
172 Titus 2:10
173 Titus 2:11
174 Ambrosiaster at Titus 2:12 CSEL 81.3 33:2–3
175 Jerome *Comm in Titum* at 2:11–14 CCL 77C 52:370–1
176 Theophylact *Comm in Titum* ad 2:10 PG 125 161A
177 John 7:16
178 Titus 3:4
179 Titus 3:6

differently, teaching the sacred trinity of the persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, from this passage,[180] and so does Ambrose[181] and in brief all the other ancient writers. For the word 'humanity,' which in Greek is *φιλανθρωπία*, deceived some recent writers. Sancho introduces Ambrose against this without connection with the matter under discussion,[182] who from these words of Paul, 'the kingdom of Christ and God'[183] teaches that the same kingdom belongs to both of them and therefore the same divinity. While I do not refute it, at the same time it does no harm to me.

If Sancho had proposed to enumerate all the passages from which the divinity of Christ is proven to be equal with that of the Father, he has presented very little; if he decided to refute what has been said by me concerning the clear appellation,[184] too much.

To the Hebrews, chapter one.[185] **'Your throne, O God, is forever.'**

When I talked about the evangelical and apostolic writings, if anyone pressed me, I could pretend that the author of this epistle was uncertain, unless perhaps by now this will also be included among the articles of faith, at which time I will make every effort to show that this letter was written by the apostle Paul.

I could put forward as a pretext the ambiguity of the language, as we indicated in my annotations. But the orthodox interpret otherwise. I welcome their interpretation but that does not change the nature of the language.

I could pretend that this passage was taken from the Old Testament.[186] Here Sancho asks whether it will lack authority. On the contrary, it has more authority with me, but in the meantime it is not said to be a letter of the apostles, strictly speaking, unless perhaps they will be said to be my words when

* * * * *

180 Jerome *Comm in Ep ad Titum* at 3:6 CCL 77C 62–3:131–6
181 Ambrosiaster at Titus 3:6 CSEL 81.3 331:25–32
182 Ambrose *De fide ad Gratianum* 3.12.101 CSEL 78 144:59–63
183 Eph 5:5
184 In his *Apologia contra Stunicam* IX-2 124:321–2, above p 56, he said, 'it is possible that it cannot be read anywhere that the name of God is openly attributed to Christ.'
185 Heb 1:8
186 Ps 45:6, 'Your throne, O God, endures forever and ever.'

I enumerate Sancho's words. Or the verses that he quotes from Aratus,[187] Menander[188] and Epimenides'[189] will be said to be Paul's.

But what he adds is also quite feeble, for example, according to this reasoning the precept about loving God and other moral precepts will not be evangelical since they were handed down previously by Moses, although I spoke not about things but about linguistic usage.

Epistle of John, chapter five.[190] 'So that we may know the true God and be in his true Son. He is the true God and eternal life.'

In my annotations I taught that in the Greek manuscripts God is not added.[191] And if one analyses the progression of the language, he will discern that it was added by an interpreter. For the mention of divine generation precedes this, that those who were born of God are not touched by that evil one, that is, the devil, who is a liar and 'prince of this world.'[192] And the 'whole world is placed under the evil one,'[193] and with false good things fabricates the semblance of happiness. We, however, who are not of this world, but were born from God, know that Christ came and by his teaching would open our mind so that we will clearly know him who is true, that is, God, who does not lie nor deceive by the false appearance of good. And now we are not in the deceitful world, but in that which is true, and this through Jesus, his Son, by whose preaching we know God the Father. For among the Greeks it reads not 'in his true Son' but 'in that true one, in his Son.'

Furthermore no one does not know that *in* is used at random in the place of *per*. But we oppose so many Greek manuscripts, including the less

* * * * *

187 Acts 17:28. Aratus of Soli was a Greek poet who flourished in the early third century BC. His only surviving work is the *Phaenomena*, a didactic poem which describes the constellations and weather signs.

188 1 Cor 15:33. Menander (342–290 BC) was the greatest dramatist of New Athenian Comedy.

189 Titus 1:12; Epimenides was a Cretan seer of the late seventh century BC.

190 1 John 5:20

191 *Annot in* NT (1516 and all later editions) 1 John 5:20

192 John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11

193 John 5:19

suspect,[194] to the Codex Rhodiensis,[195] which Zúñiga boasts of. *Τὸν ἀληθινόν* (ie 'the true'), without the addition of the name God, took precedence since indisputably it has the meaning of God the Father. And likewise it repeats afterwards: 'and we are in the truth,' that is, in the Father, of whom I just spoke, from whom we were reborn through Christ. For Christ was his word instead of his seed.

But if someone strongly contends that 'God' should be added, since it is apparent that it is said of God, this is in support of me. For it is in close vicinity, which the pronoun 'this' repeats: 'This is the true God.' The added article is in support of me too also: *ὁ ἀληθινός*, that is, the true God, of whom we just made mention. For it is not necessary that the pronoun always indicates that which is nearest in position.

But, he said, through the testimony of this passage certain orthodox writers fight against the Arians. I do not deny it, nor did it escape me. But the ancient writers allow this to themselves more often than I would wish, violently twisting the sacred Scripture whenever they fight against heretics, which we taught in the *Method*, also adding some examples.[196]

At the end of this disputation Sancho encourages me with his kindness because in the first annotation I wrote circumspectly that 'I do not know whether it is read anywhere that the name of God is openly attributed to Christ except in two or three places,' so that there is no other danger than that I either did not know or did not remember what was written; but it is more problematic, however, that in the *Apologia* against Zúñiga I add that it is barely found in two places according to this reasoning. But I interpret what 'according to this reasoning' means: 'When I spoke about the open attribution of the word God, testifying with reasoning that it can be inferred from several passages, recognizing that the Father is called God in so many places, while the Son is pointed out rather than named,' to such an extent that if Scripture said: God created the Son similar and equal to himself in every way, the testimony could be said to be manifest, but the appellation could not be manifest, 'since it is clear in what the interpreters do not vary, which does not depend on allegories; about which no one can be equivocal,' either

* * * * *

194 Ie unlike the Codex Rhodiensis, they need not be suspected of having been influenced by the Vulgate.

195 The Codex Rhodiensis was a Greek manuscript of the Catholic Epistles consulted and quoted by Zúñiga, who pointed out that in 1 John 20 the Codex Rhodiensis had *τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν*. Many manuscripts have *τὸν ἀληθινόν*, which Erasmus chose to read.

196 *Methodus* ed. Holborn 160:24–6

by blaming the meaning or the readings. 'Since I spoke of the apostolic writings,' that is, when they do not cite extraneous matters but speak of Christ in their own words, following this reasoning, I say, it will be difficult to find two passages.[197]

What I annotated, Tertullian annotated before me, and likewise Ambrose. I indicated the habitual practice of Scripture when there is no controversy about the subject matter. Sancho does not accept 'two or three' instead of 'a few' because of the exceptive[198] word *praeterquam* [meaning except], as if we always had to speak according to the laws of dialectics, which not even Aristotle himself does all the time, who in conformity with the common manner of speech among the Greeks sometimes uses two negatives although they accomplish nothing more than one. If I had wished it to be clearly understood that there are no more passages than three, I would have said two, or at the most, three. When I say: 'He has nothing from me except one or two coins,' no one will fail to understand that a few coins are meant. If I say that he only wrote to me once or twice, everyone will understand that he wrote to me rarely.

And when I first wrote these things I did not expect that a world of this kind would come into existence, in which nothing is free of sycophants. Accordingly, although there was nothing in my words that could offend men of principle, nevertheless I removed that entire passage in the third edition.[199] For I would wish that Christ were called true God in sacred Scripture even six hundred times although we are no less convinced of this if it had been said six thousand times. Would that all Jews were equally persuaded.

From Acts, chapter 4.[200] The annotation of Diego López Zúñiga on the annotation of Erasmus from Acts chapter 4.[201]

The old translation: 'For Herod and Pontius Pilate truly gathered together in this city against your child Jesus.' Erasmus in the Annotations:[202] 'Valla is indignant at this passage because the translator conferred the name of servant on Jesus, the Son of God, although *puer* (boy) also means son in

* * * * *

197 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 130:417–24, above p 60
198 The adjective *exceptivus* used here, meaning 'making an exception,' is an example of medieval dialectic language.
199 In the third edition of the NT (1522) Erasmus omitted the remark.
200 Acts 4:27
201 This whole section, up to n217 is a direct quotation of Zúñiga.
202 The following paragraph is taken from the *Annot in NT* at Acts 4:27.

Latin, but infrequently, more frequently servant, and most frequently a man of young age. But when Christ brought salvation he was not a child, and the name servant does not befit him, even if he obeyed and was subject to the Father after becoming man, but as a Son, not a servant. Therefore here *παῖδα* had to be translated Son, not boy, etc.

Zúñiga: 'Here *παῖδα* should not have been translated Son, but boy, as the old translator translated it, and it means servant.' And Christ is rightly called the servant of God in accordance with his taking on humanity. Thus also, St Jerome, explaining that passage from Isaiah 42,[203] which Matthew cites in chapter 12, namely: 'Behold my child, whom I have chosen,'[204] which in Hebrew says 'Behold my servant, etc.' Jerome says: 'It is not strange if he is called a servant, having come into being from a woman and having come into being under the law,[205] who, since he was in the form of God, humbled himself, taking on the form of a servant and was found in human form.'[206] The same thing occurs in book eleven of the questions to Algasia,[207] second question; expounding the same passage from Isaiah, he said: 'Therefore the servant of Almighty God according to the dispensation of the flesh he had taken on, who is sent to us, was called Saviour, to whom in another passage the Father says: "It is a great thing that you should be called my servant, that you may bring together the tribes of Jacob."'[208] Likewise in the prologue of book 17 of the commentaries on Isaiah: 'The servant of the Lord,' he said, 'is he to whom the Father speaks in Isaiah: "It is a great thing that you should be called my servant."'[209] And in another passage: 'Behold my servant whom I have elected, and my delight, in whom my soul took pleasure.'[210] Likewise in the commentary on the Psalm, the one expounding the words from Psalm 68: 'Do not turn your face from your servant.'[211] 'The voice of Christ,' he says, 'who took the form of a servant, to his Father, as the prophet said: "It is a great thing for you to be called my servant."' Also in the commentaries to the epistle to Titus, chapter one: 'It is not surprising,' he said, 'that although they were holy men, nonetheless they are nobly called the servants of God, when

* * * * *

203 Isa 42:1
204 Matt 12:18
205 Gal 4:4
206 Phil 2:6–7
207 Jerome *Ep* 121 CSEL 56 9; PL 22 1010
208 Isa 49:6
209 Ibid.
210 Isa 42:1
211 Ps 69:17

through the prophet Isaiah the Father speaks to the Son: "It is a great thing for you to be called my servant," as it is said in Greek, *μέγα σοί ἐστι κληθῆναι παῖδά μου*. Servant, that is *παῖς*, because according to the Greeks it can mean both servant and son. We searched it in Hebrew and we found that "my son" was not written, but my servant, that is עבד, whence also the prophet Abdias, who interprets "servant of the Lord," received the name from his service to God. If it disturbs someone that the Lord Saviour, who is the creator of the universe, is called the servant of God, he will not be disturbed if he will hear him saying to the apostles: "Whoever wishes to be greater among you must be the servant of all, and the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister;"[212] so that he would not seem to teach only by words, he demonstrated by example. Taking a towel he girded himself and filling a basin with water he washed the feet of his disciples. Therefore it is not impious to believe that he who had assumed the form of a servant did things which are fitting for a servant so that he may be said to have served the will of his father when he himself served with his servants.'[213] Here ends Jerome.

Finally, Ambrose in his seventh letter concerning Lent confutes the error of a certain Apollinarist[214] heretic who could not take seriously that our Lord Jesus Christ had subjected himself to servitude for us in assuming a human body, because he said that he had assumed the form of a servant according to the apostle Paul, and that the word servant was not read elsewhere. And he teaches that in many testimonies of sacred Scripture Christ the Lord inasmuch as he was man could be said rightly and piously to be the servant of God. And that passage of the Apostle, 'taking the form of a servant,'[215] signified the fullness of nature and human perfection just as that other passage, 'who though in the form of God signifies in the fullness of divinity, in that expression of divine perfection.'[216]

Since this is so, let Erasmus, who calls himself a theologian, see to it that when he said the appellation of servant was not suitable for Christ, he does not fall into the heresy of the Apollinarists. For what he added immediately, that even if Christ obeyed and was subject to the Father in that he had become man, nevertheless he obeyed his Father as a Son, not as a servant, one must also take care that it is not redolent of Arius. For since the Son is equal

* * * * *

212 Matt 20:27–8; Mark 10:44–5
213 Jerome *Comm in Titum* 1.1 CCL 77C 5–6:18–36
214 See n232 below.
215 Phil 2:7
216 Ambrose *Ep* 7.39 CSEL 82.2 31:80–1

to the Father and obedience and subjection indicate his inferiority, it is clear that Christ did not obey the Father and was subject to him as a Son, but as a servant, that is, in keeping with his having become man. But these matters and numerous others of this kind from Erasmus' *Annotations* which exhibit not a little impiety, unless it is rather to be considered ignorance, we reserve for a second volume.[217]

The response of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam to the annotations of Diego López Zúñiga, from the fourth chapter of Acts.

'For they really gathered together in the city.'[218] In Greek the word is *παῖδα*, but I preferred it to be translated Son rather than boy, and this was the opinion of Valla. I know that Jerome in many passages contends that the name servant is fitting for Christ. In opposition he who wrote the commentaries to the epistle to the Hebrews that are attributed to Chrysostom does not allow this name to be attributed to Christ.[219] And Ambrose does not approve those who ascribe to Christ the form of a servant because he took on human nature, but because he was killed and nailed to the cross as a lowly servant. But I do not include myself with this contention. I said that the name servant does not befit Christ, as it did not befit the apostles: 'I shall not call you servants any more, but friends.'[220] Christ obeyed not as a servant, but as a Son, for he obeyed of his own free will out of love, not fear. Nor do I see why we would shrink back from the idea that Christ is called a servant according to nature since he is a man, nor why we dispute it intensely, especially since according to sacred Scripture this name neither can be asserted as certain, nor can it be ignored, since as the Greek word *παῖς* is ambiguous, so they say is the Hebrew word corresponding to it.

But since we responded long ago to Lee concerning this word,[221] I do not think it is worthwhile to repeat here what we wrote. I will merely touch on what Zúñiga introduced in a particular manner. He who previously only played the role of a grammarian, now threatens something theological against me as if I were a theologian (for I boast of this name, as he said). He declares the danger of a double heresy if I deny that Christ was a servant, one

* * * * *

217 Zúñiga refers to his *Erasmi Roterodami blasphemiae et impietates,* which he would never be allowed to publish.
218 Acts 4:27
219 Chrysostom *Hom in Hebraeos* 3, 1 and 3 PG 63:29 and 31
220 John 15:15
221 *Responsio ad annot Ed. Lei* ASD IX-4 208–11

of which is of the Apollinarists and the other of the Arians. As if anyone who would deny that Christ is called a servant in the Scriptures would deprive him of a human nature, or if anyone should say that Christ obeyed the Father as far as the cross, he would share the Arian opinion of Christ, who say that the Son is not equal to the Father. And so that this no less insolent than unlearned slander of this man Zúñiga may be apparent to all, I shall quote his own words. For when he had cited a summary of what Ambrose discusses in his epistle 47, he adds: 'Since this is the case, let Erasmus, who calls himself a theologian, see to it that when he said the appellation "servant" is not suitable for Christ, he does not fall into the error of the Apollinarists. For what he added immediately, that even if Christ obeyed and was subject to the Father in that he had become man, nevertheless he obeyed his Father as a Son, not as a servant, one must take care that it is not redolent of Arius. For since the Son is equal to the Father and obedience and subjection indicate inferiority, it is clear that Christ did not obey the Father and was subject not as a Son but as a servant, that is, in keeping with his becoming man.'

After he vomited forth such inanities, he added this beautiful clause. 'But,' he said, 'these and other matters of this nature from Erasmus' *Annotations*, which display not a little impiety, unless it should rather be considered as ignorance, we reserve for a second volume.'[222] Thus far Zúñiga, who as long as he confined himself within the limits of Nebrija's annotations, had something worthy, in any event, of being read. But after leaping beyond the pit[223] he began to serve as a tool for some sycophant pseudo-monk (I can suspect no other than this hired actor who was suborned to perform the play), he raves on pathetically.

First of all, I nowhere contend that Christ cannot be called the servant of God, who makes himself a minister to all. 'The Son of man did not come to be served,' said Christ, 'but to serve.'[224] But, said Zúñiga, he is called a servant for the same reason that he is called man. I for my part do not very much wish to refute this for the moment, even if Ambrose teaches differently in his narration of the epistle to the Philippians, chapter 2. These are his words: 'However, he is not said to have received the form of God, but to be in the form of God; he is said to have received the form of a servant, while he is humiliated like a sinner. Servants come about from sin. So Ham was the

* * * * *

222 See n217 above.
223 *Adagia* I x 93
224 Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45

son of Noah, who first deservedly received the name of servant.'[225] You hear, reader, that Ambrose did not attribute to Christ the name of servant because he assumed humanity, but because he received the wrongs of human nature which was subject to sins. And lest you think this is my commentary listen to what follows later: 'For it does not seem to me,' he says, 'as it seems to certain persons, that he received the form of a servant when he was born as a man.' And in that same place it follows immediately: 'For see what he says: "Let the same mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus,[226] that is, God and man." Before the incarnation one can say either Christ or Jesus because both names are similar and signify both the son of man and the Son of God. For before the nativity, what does he say, among other things? Christ was the rock[227] and let us not tempt Christ, as some others have tried. Therefore where Scripture wishes to signify either God or man, it writes one of two, either Jesus or Christ.'[228] Thus far Ambrose.

To what end are these words directed except to signify the nature in Christ on either side, either we say Jesus or Christ; wishing to signify the injuries received, let us say 'servant.' Before taking on humanity one could not be called 'servant.' After putting aside mortality he ceased to be called a servant. He who wrote this, whoever he was, seems to have understood this. For I suspect some patch was sewed on to Ambrose's commentaries, as we now have in the *Ordinary Gloss*.

But in the epistle he condemns as a heretic him who said that Christ was not called a servant. First of all, let the calumniator distinguish to which he prefers to give more weight, the sacred commentary or the epistle which he sent to a friend. And yet, if one looks into it more closely, Ambrose means the same thing in the epistle that he teaches in the commentaries. That heretic said that Christ did not really suffer. But he could not have truly suffered if he had not been true man. Inasmuch as he suffered, he was called a servant; he suffered according to his human nature. So it comes about that he who does not admit that he truly suffered will deny that he was true man. It does not immediately follow, however, that he had been called a servant simply inasmuch as he was man; for he could be man and yet be exempt from affliction and suffering. Indeed, in that same epistle he wishes Christ to be called a servant just as he was called sin, malediction, and opprobrium. These things

* * * * *

225 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81.3 330
226 Phil 2:5
227 1 Cor 10:4
228 Ambrosiaster

did not befit him unless he had been man, and yet did not befit him inasmuch as he was man; for he could be man without being sin. This is the magnificent lemma by which my egregious critic Zúñiga makes me an Apollinarist.

Now see with what arguments he makes me an Arian. 'He obeyed,' said Erasmus, 'and was subject, but not as a servant, but as the Son. But the Son is equal to the Father, therefore it could not be that the Son was subject to the Father.' 'O shrewdness more blunt than a pestle,'[229] said Jerome. In so many passages Paul and John call those reborn in Christ sons of God, and will Christ, inasmuch as he was man, not be called the son of God? Especially since in the gospel Christ himself responded to this calumny. The Son of God is equal to the Father and the Son of God is less than the Father, because Christ is called the Son of God for a twofold reason, nature and grace. But in whatever manner you regard the Son of God, this statement, 'the Son of God was subject to the Father' sounds no more like heresy than this: the Son of God died and was buried. Nor at the same time is what Zúñiga assumes always true, that anyone who is said to have obeyed or been subject is inferior. Jesus obeyed and was subject to Mary and Joseph though he was superior to both.

To conclude, if one fulfils a duty through fear of evil or through necessity of his condition is called a servant, it would be absurd to call Christ a servant, and not even we, as long as we are inspired by the spirit of children, in which we cry 'Abba, Father'[230] seek of our own accord what is pious. But if one is called servant who surrenders to another's will and is a diligent follower of another's will, nothing prevents Christ being called a servant of God according to his human nature, but in such a way that in the meantime nothing prevents the same person being called the Son of God in conformity with that same nature because he allowed it willingly, not through fear but by the impulse of charity.

There you have the impudent calumny of Zúñiga. And another work of similar annotations is promised. But I would prefer to be liable to any heretical opinion because of a simple error of the intellect, which we see happened to Jerome, Cyprian, and other very esteemed orthodox figures, rather than to suffer from an illness from which whoever wrote this seemed to have suffered. For one or the other of two things follows: that either he was an impudent sycophant or he hired out his work to such persons. Do I deprive Christ of human nature when I adore it in so many books? Do I who execrate the

* * * * *

229 *Adagia* III vi 21. Used also by Jerome *Epistles* 69.44
230 Rom 8:15

Arians so many times make Christ inferior to the Father according to his divine nature? I defended myself from heresy, let him defend himself from the suspicion of a perverse and malicious calumny. Let him call me a Dutchman, untaught, crass, dull-witted, ignorant, stupid, insensitive, a blockhead, I will not be very moved. Who would put up with being charged with such names as if by a barefaced buffoon with suspicions of a twofold heresy, not of the type that harms a priest or scholastic decrees but Christ himself? Yet I have no doubt that this Zúñiga thinks of himself as extremely witty and facetious.

Fourth chapter of Acts
'For they truly gathered together in this city against your holy servant Jesus'[231]

Would that here Sancho had convinced himself so to direct the powers of his mind as to advance Christian piety as he showed himself an extraordinary craftsman in attracting suspicion and envy against me. He scrutinized even single syllables, not failing to distort and twist everything into calumny, in the meantime pouring clouds of smoke on the unwary readers with frequent mention of Arians, Apollinarists, and Sabellians,'[232] often citing writers of great name. And he does battle with no less enthusiasm to maintain Zúñiga's authority in a good state of repairs than if he had undertaken to defend Paul or any of the evangelists, since the man's writings are of such a kind that they commend the author very little to the – I shall not say – open-minded readers, but even those prejudiced against me.

For when he, as I hear, had been obscure even among his followers previously,[233] he became known only through the petulance of his pen, first

* * * * *

231 Acts 4:27

232 Arians believed that the Son of God did not always exist but was begotten by God the Father at a certain point in time. He was not consubstantial with the Father but was of like essence. Arianism was declared to be a heresy at the Council of Nicaea in 325. According to the belief of Apollinaris of Laodicea in the latter part of the fourth century Christ had a human body but a divine mind, which denies the doctrine of the hypostatic union of the two natures, divine and human. It was declared a heresy at the First Council of Constantinople in 381. The Sabellians believed that the three persons of the Trinity are three different modes or aspects of God rather than three distinct persons within the Godhead. The heresy is attributed to a certain Sabellius, who is said to have taught in Rome in the early third century.

233 That is, in Spain

assailing Lefèvre d'Etaples,[234] then me, and suddenly he emerged in the matters aggravated by the Lutheran tragedy in the kind of situations in which even Androclides goes to war.[235] And just as in the body impure humours flow in an abscess, so these people who have sprung forth aggravate public troubles.

Since Sancho treats this matter not only quite verbosely, but also quite obscurely and cryptically, not without a certain skill in distortion, in order to alleviate the boredom of the reader, I will explain the whole issue briefly in a cruder fashion.[236]

The word 'servant' among the Greeks and the Latins denotes something abject and a certain indignity. Thus, he who answers in a commonplace and undignified manner is said to answer servilely. For no other reason ancient society called servants *famuli* because they were of the same family and in Greek *παῖδας* because to them it was a name used in common with the children of the family. Accordingly, it was the orthodox writers of old who were averse to this word, and they thought it was not appropriate to Christ, who is not susceptible to any indignity or servility. And of this number was John Chrysostom,[237] the most esteemed writer among orthodox authors, in my opinion. And following him, Lorenzo Valla annotated something similar in this passage,[238] whose opinion we recorded in the first edition of the New Testament, and of course not without mentioning the name of the author. But Jerome disagrees in many places, contending that the name of servant is rightly attributed to Christ according to his assuming human nature, whose opinion I also enumerate.[239] And in order to refute any objections concerning 'he was subject to the Father until death'[240] I had written that this does not prove that the word servant applies to him, because he obeyed, certainly, 'but as a son, not as a servant.'[241]

* * * * *

234 Zúñiga had published his *Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem* at Alcalá in 1519.

235 *Adagia* II ii 91; the meaning of the adage is that in civil war anyone at all can play the general.

236 *Adagia* I i 37; literally, 'with a crasser Minerva.'

237 Chrysostom *Hom in Hebraeos* 3 at 1:6-8 PG 63 253–6

238 Valla *Annot. in Novum Testamentum,* at Acts 4:27, *Opera omnia,* Basel 1540 repr. Turin 1962. Valla argued that *puer* is too deprecatory a term for Christ.

239 In his *Annotationes contra Erasmum* (1520) Zúñiga had quoted five passages from Jerome in which he had justified the term '*puer*.'

240 Phil 2:8

241 Namely, in the *Annot in* NT in *Novum Instrumentum* 380

From these words Zúñiga stirs up a remarkable tragedy and thrusts in the suspicions of a double heresy,[242] with words that are quite alarming. Since I took this calumny rather resentfully, however lenient I was towards the rest, Sancho rushed to the attack like the crab that came to the aid of the hydra,[243] as if he had little venom himself: there is no stone he does not move to oppress me with this envy.[244]

I will say this first of all: since all my writings defend me from the suspicion of the error, or rather madness of the Apollinarists or others who deprived Christ of human nature, and since no Christian today is so out of his mind as to dream any such thing of Christ; furthermore, since in many passages I express abhorrence for the impudence of the Arians, who made Christ inferior to the Father even according to his divine nature; since everywhere I profess that he is equal to the Father, there could not have been any controversy between us in the matter. If there is any misgiving, it is only in the wording. And yet, whenever there is agreement in the subject matter, there should be no fierce gladiatorial contest concerning the words, and it is befitting of Christian kindness to take it in good part even if something was said ambiguously. For no one brings the false claim of heresy against Augustine as if he believed that the two natures are confused in Christ as water is mixed with wine in the chalice, because he wrote more than once that in Christ man was mixed together with God and what scholastic theologians call with the neologism 'unitio' he calls a mixture.[245] For it is apparent from his other books what he understood.[246]

Similarly, since it is plainly apparent from my books that I have nothing in common with the Apollinarists or the Arians, even if I had written something in words that were not suitable to the subject, perhaps I was worthy of

* * * * *

242 Arianism and Apollinarism, cf n232.

243 In his struggle with the hydra of Lerna every time Hercules cut off its head, two grew back in its place. He called upon his nephew Iolaus to scorch the stump after each decapitation. When Athena saw that he was winning, she sent a huge crab to distract him but Hercules crushed it under his foot. In the end Hercules cut off the hydra's one immortal head and dipped his arrows in the poisonous head for further conflicts.

244 *Adagia* I iv 30, 'to leave no stone unturned.'

245 Augustine *Epistle 137 ad Volusianum* 137.11 CCL 31B; PL 33 520. The scholastic term 'unitio' signifies the connection of Christ's divine and human nature, conceived to be so close that it amounted to a mixture of both.

246 As, for example, in his *Sermones* 7.14 CCL 41 72, where he says that the Catholic faith believes in God in three persons, a trinity of one substance, inseparably and equally, not confused by a mixture.

being warned but unworthy of being the object of the most heinous suspicion of all. Having said this, I shall gird myself for the matter at hand.

In the first place, as far as the name servant is concerned, since I relate another's opinion, the contention should have been with the one whose opinion I enumerate. I testify that Lorenzo affirms this with ill-temper, which I merely annotate, neither affirming nor contending anything.[247] But if I were for the most part of the same opinion held by Chrysostom and Lorenzo among many others, it was not just that I alone, as if I were the author of this opinion, should be called to justice. This is the first clear proof not of an insincere spirit but of one seeking the opportunity to calumniate. The proof that I did not emphatically approve of Lorenzo's opinion could be this indication, that I say: 'Valla is angry in this passage.' But his opinion was compatible to me at the moment since he did not like the word servant or child in this context. And what is more, in the second edition I moderated these words in this way: 'And perhaps the appellation servant does not suit him.'[248] And yet if I had agreed completely with Chrysostom and Lorenzo and the others, even if Jerome disagrees with them and opposes their opinion as far as he can, he does not reveal any suspicion of heresy, nor does he mention the Apollinarists or the Arians.

Nor does anything else come into question except whether from the usage of sacred Scripture the name servant is appropriate for Christ. Whether it is attributed to him in the Old Testament, let others see to it. For they say that the Hebrew word also, which the Septuagint translated as *παῖς*, is ambiguous.[249] It does not immediately follow that if David or Jacob or any other one who serves as a type for Christ is called servant, therefore the same name is suited to Christ.

At all events, the writings of the New Testament seem to have refrained from the word servant. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews[250] asserts the dignity of Christ with this argument, that God calls the angels his ministers, but called Christ his Son, not minister, although the word minister is more honourable than servant. Again, in the same place[251] he prefers him to Moses with this name because Moses did not remain in the house as a servant, but

* * * * *

247 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* ASD VI-6 216:949–50
248 ASD VI-6 216:953–4
249 This is not correct for the Hebrew word עבד is less ambiguous than *παῖς* and *puer*, since it means just 'slave or servant,' not 'son.'
250 Heb 1:4–7
251 Heb 3:3–7

Christ as the Son will remain forever. He (ie Christ) in the evangelical writings has the name Father in his mouth so often, the word Lord never. He confesses himself to be the Son of God,[252] never his servant. 'Father,' he said, 'glorify your Son so that your Son may glorify you.'[253] In parables he designates the prophets and apostles by the name 'servants,' himself he designates 'son,' as the one in which he teaches that after the servants were sent away the son was killed in the end by the tenants.[254] And in the parable of the servants awaiting their master.[255] Likewise in the servants to whom he had entrusted the talents.[256] Again in the servant who was a steward.[257] Again in another, about the one who in the absence of his master began to drink with fellow drunkards and to slay his fellow servants.[258] Once again in the parable in which the servant is punished for not being willing to have mercy on his fellow servant while he had experienced the clemency of his master.[259] Again in the parable of the banquet[260] and many others he makes himself the son or king[261] or father of the family,[262] the servant never.

Already in the apostolic epistles, although the names of Father and Son are repeated many times, the word servant is never found except in one passage,[263] the difficulties of which I will discuss later. In addition, the name servant according to the everyday usage of speech denotes something averse to the dignity of Christ, as he himself teaches in the gospel, removing this name from his disciples,[264] as those to whom he had revealed everything that he had received from the Father, and whom he loved as friends and by whom he wished to be loved rather than feared. Again in this passage Sancho plays the dialectician rather childishly. It doesn't follow, he says, that they were not servants because Christ did not call them servants. And he interprets in this way: 'I shall not call you servants, but nonetheless you will be servants.' More precisely, Christ added the reason why he did not call them

* * * * *

252 Matt 14:61–2
253 John 17:1
254 Mark 12:1–2; Matt 21:33–40; Luke 20:9–19
255 Matt 24:45–7; Luke 12:42–3
256 Mattt 25:14–30; Luke 19:11–27
257 Luke 16:1–8
258 Matt 24:48–51; Luke 12:45–6
259 Matt 18:23–35
260 Matt 22:2–14; Luke 14:15–24
261 Matt 22:2–14
262 Matt 24:45–51
263 Phil 2:7
264 John 15:15

servants. This reason, if it is legitimate, will follow; if the reason is removed, certainly, according to this reasoning, the name servant does not befit them. Paul teaches the same thing, crying out many times that his followers 'have not received again the spirit of servitude in fear, but the spirit of adoption of the sons of God, in which we cry "Abba, Father."'[265] Accordingly, he said, now he is not a servant, but a son.[266]

Then again, distinguishing the dignity and freedom of sons whom God considers worthy of the inheritance of eternal life, he introduces the example of Hagar and Isaac, and relates it to us.[267] The maid Hagar was ejected from the house together with her son; Isaac remained in the house as an heir. 'So now we are not sons of the servant, but of the free woman.' But what is the purpose of occupying the reader with passages of this kind when all the writings of the apostles and evangelists resound with almost nothing else than the words Father and Son?

Furthermore, the prophet Malachias teaches that son is the name of charity whereas servant is the name of fear; through his mouth the Lord thus remonstrates: 'If then I am a father, where is my honour? And if I am a master, where is the respect due to me?'[268] You see that from a servant the feeling of love is not required, but fear. But if according to the evangelical precept[269] they are called servants who do not know the intention of their master, certainly this explanation does not apply in any way to Christ, who was ignorant of nothing about his Father. And if according to Paul and the prophet[270] it is the nature of servants to fear, the name 'servant' is certainly not appropriate to Christ, in whom perfect charity excluded all fear. Surely from this passage[271] it is not possible that Christ be called a servant since the Greek word is *παῖς*, not *δοῦλος*,[272] especially since the most respected author of the church here read 'son' for 'servant,' as does Hilary narrating the psalm,

* * * * *

265 Rom 8:15
266 De Jonge reveals that this conclusion of Erasmus is incorrect for Rom 8:15 does not deal with Christ's relationship to the Father.
267 It is taken from Gal 4:21–31.
268 Mal 1:6
269 John 15:15, 'I do not call you servants any longer because the servant does not know what the master is doing, but I have called you friends because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father.'
270 Rom 8:5 and Mal 1:6
271 Acts 4:27
272 Ie slave

'Why have the people grumbled.'[273] Likewise Ambrose in his book *On the Vocation of the Gentiles*, book 2, chapter 5;[274] Cassiodorus in his narration of the psalm, 'Why have the people grumbled';[275] and older than all of these, Tertullian in his book *Against Praxeas*.[276]

So then the situation is much different than what Sancho too strongly affirms, for he denies that in this passage there can be any other reading then 'servant.' And if what he contends were true, although the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words are ambiguous, he gets nowhere with this argument.

But Sancho pressures me with dialectical (as he imagines) intricacies. In the gospel of John Christ calls his Father his God,[277] but the word God denotes dominion; it follows therefore that Christ is the servant of the Father according to his assumed nature. To this I shall soon respond more accurately, satisfied to have said this for the time being, that God is a word of nature, Lord, of relation. Consequently, even before the world was founded, God existed, but the Lord did not. Similarly we are not arguing about the reality and the attribution of the word. I hear my God, I do not hear 'my Lord.'

But in the mystical writings of the Old Testament the Father is called Lord.[278] '"Protect me, O Lord, for I have hoped in you." And I said to the Lord: "You are my God."'[279] To these and similar statements I could answer that Christ in prayers of this kind was supporting the person of his body, that is, of his members. Otherwise, how could those words that are spoken in the psalm: 'Far from salvation are my words of my offenses'[280] apply to him who had no faults? But he is said to have what he has in his members because of the mystic communion of head and body.

But Sancho will press on more closely to the truth: hanging on the cross, he uttered words from the psalm: 'Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit.'[281] These words seem to befit Christ precisely since he speaks of his

* * * * *

273 Ps 2:1. Hilary *Tractatus in Ps 2* CCL 61 40:11
274 Prosper Aquitanus *De vocatione omnium gentium* (formerly attributed to Ambrose) PL 51 701A
275 Cassiodorus *Expos in Ps 2* PL 70 36
276 Tertullian *Adversus Praxean* 28.2 CCL 2 1200:11–12
277 John 20:17, 'I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.'
278 The mystical writings of the Old Testament are those in which, according to an allegorical interpretation, Christ is supposed to be speaking or to be referred to, especially certain Psalms.
279 Ps 16:1–2
280 Ps 22:2
281 Ps 31:6

spirit, which he was about to breathe out. And here, lest I resort to evasion, Sancho cites the author Mark to me, chapter 23.[282] In this case I find Sancho lacking in carefulness, he who so captiously calumniates the most minute matters in others. These words are found in no other evangelist than Luke, and in him instead of 'Lord' we read 'Father': 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' Therefore this passage acts very much against Sancho, for although in the psalm there is the word 'Lord,' as soon as we come to that passage which pertained specifically to him, Christ changed 'Lord' into 'Father,' although in this part of the verse which Jesus pronounced, there is not the word 'Lord' but in the next part: 'You have redeemed me, O Lord, God of truth.'[283] Jesus removed that part which fit in then to suit the time, and he added the name 'Father' to it on his own. And yet this is the passage from which Sancho especially hoped for triumph.

And what Sancho puts forward as if from dialectical mysteries is not always true: that relative names at the same time can be either maintained or removed. More precisely 'lord' is often a word of honour, not of dominion, unless perhaps when we greet honourable men passing by as lords, they in turn must greet us as servants. That this is true is clear even from Martial: 'When I call you lord, don't think well of yourself, Cinna, I often also return the greeting of my servant.'[284]

Therefore, as we often call ourselves servants of this or that person for the sake of modesty, so for the sake of honour, we frequently call those to whom we owe no servitude lords. And I do not know whether the Hebrew word has the same meaning as 'lord' has among us.[285] Certainly among the Greeks *κύριος* is frequently a word of honour, *δεσπότης* not in the same way, as among the Latins *herus* is a word of dominion rather than honour.

Let us come therefore to the sacred anchor[286] of Sancho. That is a passage in the epistle to the Philippians: 'But he emptied himself, taking the form of a servant.'[287] Here Erasmus remains in the middle. And yet, all the

* * * * *

282 This is a slip for Luke 23:46.

283 Ps 31:6

284 Martial 5.57.2

285 For the Latin word *Domine* in Ps 31:5 the Hebrew text has the tetragrammaton יהוה, which is the name of the God of Israel, not the polite term of address for any male person.

286 *Adagia* I i 24. This refers to the sheet-anchor, a large anchor used only in emergencies.

287 See *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Phil 2:7 ASD VI-9 288:229–42, where Erasmus quotes Ambrosiaster on Phil 2:7–9 CSEL 81.3 141.

same, I have taught that Ambrose so interprets this passage that the form of God is understood as a specimen and an example, as he calls it, because by his miracles and resurrection he declared that he was God. He so interprets 'form of a servant' that it will not be said that he took the form of a servant because he was made man, but because as a guilty person and a sinner he should be scourged and crucified. For he said that servitude arose from sin.[288] But in Christ as there was no sin, so there was no servitude.

But here Sancho will tell me that this work is not by the divine Ambrose. Ridiculous, since it is cited so many times by Peter Lombard,[289] easily the prince of theologians by his own calculation, nor does the style deny it.[290]

But the same Ambrose holds one opinion at one time and another at another time.[291] We will see about this a little later. In the meantime let us grant that he has another opinion, it is sufficient for me that this passage admits of a double interpretation, neither of which has been rejected to this point as heretical.

Here Sancho interposes yet another difficulty lest I be able to slip away like Proteus.[292] Erasmus, he said, in his scholia to this passage 'openly denies that the name servant befits Christ.' For he writes: 'Without any doubt Christ is not called servant, but Son.'[293] Rather I do not simply deny but I add there for what reason I deny, evidently because he obeyed through love, not fear,[294] and I do this in both passages, both the one that is in Acts, chapter four, and the one in the epistle to the Philippians, chapter two, in which

* * * * *

288 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7–8 CSEL 81.3 140

289 Peter Lombard (c 1100–60) is famous for his *Sententiarum libri quattuor*, the standard textbook of Catholic theology in the Middle Ages. His works contain many quotations from the Latin Fathers, including Ambrose and Ambrosiaster.

290 This is a rather surprising statement since Erasmus doubted the ascription of this commentary to Ambrose, but in his controversies with Zúñiga and Carranza he claimed that Ambrosiaster was not a homogeneous work, but a compilation based on a work of Ambrose.

291 According to Ambrose, *Ep* 1.46 PL 16 1194–6, Christ's *servitus* was his incarnation and humanity, his humiliation and suffering, whereas for Ambrosiaster it was just an aspect of his incarnation, namely, his humiliation and suffering. See ASD IX-2 144:667–80 and notes.

292 Proteus was a god of the sea who could assume all kinds of shapes to escape difficult situations.

293 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Phil 2:6, ASD VI-9 288:225–66

294 In the *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 142:610–11, p 69 above, he added a similar statement: 'Christ obeyed not as a servant, but as a Son, for he obeyed of his own will, through love, not fear.'

passage these words have scholia:[295] 'Without any doubt Christ is not called servant, but Son.' Those who know the mysteries of the Roman language understand that this is an emphasis on the adverb *certe* [certainly] so that it relaxes the contention whether the Son of God can be called in some manner a servant, but that Scripture refrains from using this word. That this is true is apparent in the writings of the New Testament. For nowhere is any mention of servant made there except in this passage, which records the form of a servant, not the name. And although this was sufficient, nevertheless in a later edition I add 'according to the opinion of Chrysostom,' and at the same time I refute what Jerome contends,[296] that Christ is called a servant because in Isaiah the Father speaks to the Son: 'It is a great thing that you are called my servant.'[297] For those who are learned in the Hebrew tongue demonstrate that the Hebrew word means domestic servant, not servant. And the Septuagint translated it *παῖς* and the old translation had 'boy,' not 'servant.' And yet even if there is no substance to what I say, nevertheless in prophecies, since the words usually pertain to some man who symbolizes Christ,[298] the humbleness of the word is not particularly offensive. Nor is it necessary that in mystical writings the individual parts accord with the allegory, as Augustine and also Chrysostom teach.

But Sancho protests: you denied openly that he is called servant, therefore he can by no means be called servant. More precisely, a little earlier in the same scholia I speak of a passage that is in the epistle to the Philippians.[299] I had taught that the form of servant spoken of by Paul is that species of guilty man, which until now was false, not because he was man but because he was guilty. Accordingly, perhaps taught by his Aristotle,[300] who prescribes that words are understood according to the matter under discussion, Sancho should have accepted in this sense what I added later: 'Certainly Christ is not called servant, but Son.'[301]

* * * * *

295 Acts 4:27; Phil 2:6

296 Jerome *Ep* 121 to Algasia PG 22 1010; Also *Comm in Titum* 1:1 PL 26 591B

297 Isa 49:6

298 This refers to what is now called typology, the study of types and symbols in the Bible, especially events in the life of Christ, that are prefigured in the Old Testament.

299 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Phil 2:6

300 Aristotle *Physics* 1.7 11a 8–12, quoted in *Annot in Novum Testamentum* ASD VI-9 289 line note 222

301 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Phil 2:6

But orthodox writers introduce this passage of Paul against two factions, of which one denies that Christ is God, and the other denies that he is man.[302] The authority of interpreters is not so great that it is never permitted to disagree, especially when a contentious obstinacy is absent. Nor is it any secret that in the fight against heretics many things are distorted to gain victory. And yet I have no intention to struggle against their interpretation. This passage undoubtedly is effective for proving Christ's divinity no matter how you explain *in forma*. But if we accept Ambrose's interpretation to demonstrate his humanity, it is not necessary that we say that Christ just took the form of a servant because he became man. And yet it follows that he who was afflicted as a guilty man was a man.

But there still remains one passage that Sancho introduces which almost escaped me. It is in chapter 15 of the first epistle to the Corinthians: 'When all things were subjected to him, then the Son himself will be subjected to the one who subjected all things to him so that God may be all things in all things.'[303] Here Sancho, who immediately forces the Sorbonne on me and the accusation that I despise scholastic dialectics, argues in this fashion: 'The appellation of subject openly befits Christ, therefore also that of servant, since servant has no other meaning than subject.' 'Like to like,'[304] as they say, I will respond. Whoever is subject is a servant; a son is subject to his father, therefore he is a servant to his father. A wife is subject to her husband. Citizens are subject to a prince, therefore they are all servants. And according to Paul,[305] the spirit of prophets is subject to prophets, therefore a servant. O unhappy me, who did not learn this dialectic. In Ambrose and Theophylact the interpretation of this passage is twofold: first, that the Son may be said to be subject in a certain way to the Father according to divine nature. Since I know this seems difficult at first sight, I shall write below the words of Ambrose: 'This is the tradition of the kingdom, that since all things were subject to the Son and they adored him as God when death had been destroyed, then the Son should show them that he is not the one from whom are all things, but through whom are all things. And this will be to deliver the kingdom to God and to the Father and to show that he is the one from whom all paternity is named in heaven and on earth.'[306] You hear, reader,

* * * * *

302 Arianism and Apollinarianism, respectively.
303 1 Cor 15:28
304 *Adagia* I i 35
305 1 Cor 14:32
306 Eph 3:15. Ambrosiaster at 1 Cor. 15:24–6 CSEL 81.2 173

that by these words it is meant that the subjection of the Son is nothing else than that the authority has been entrusted to the Father by the Son lest the Son seem greater than he or lest the Father is not understood as the author of all things that were made through the Son. And this pertains to his divine nature. Again, a little further on: 'The same meaning is contained in what he now reveals so that he will manifest what it is for the Son to transfer the kingdom to God and the Father. This, however, adds to the meaning that when the Father transfers the kingdom to the Son he will not have subjected himself to him as the Son subjected himself to the Father. The Father subjected all things to the Son, so that the Son may be honoured in a similar way as the Father is honoured.'[307] And a little further on: 'He says this because when the pride of all principalities and powers and dominations was suppressed and they adored Christ as God, then Christ because of the unique authority of the Father will show himself as God, but from God, so that the sublime and ineffable authority of the one beginning remains, that is, that the Son submit himself to the Father, that is, that God is all things in all things.'[308] And a little further on: 'The Son, however, is not so subject to the Father as creation is to the Son.'[309]

Let Sancho hear this and understand that Ambrose interprets that the Son according to his divine nature is said to be subject to the Father. But if he claims that this interpretation smacks of Arius, let him dispute with Ambrose. But if he disregards Ambrose in his commentaries and does not admit anything but his epistles, let him listen to Zúñiga's Athanasius, who to us is Theophylact:[310] 'Since I said of the Son that he would render his enemies lifeless and inane and would set up trophies, and feared they would introduce another principle and the Son would be considered uncreated, for that reason he refers everything to the Father' etc.[311] And a little later on: 'Let no one say: "And if the Father is less subject than the Son, it does not in any way prevent that the Son is more powerful than he." Paul eliminated this question, saying that the Son would subject himself to the Father. In this way he reveals a supreme concord of the Son with the Father. In consequence, I wish that you understand that there is a cause and origin of this power of the

* * * * *

307 Ambrosiaster at 1 Cor 15:28 CSEL 81.2 173–4
308 Ambrosiaster at 1 Cor 15:28 CSEL 81.2 174
309 Ambrosiaster at 1 Cor 15:28 CSEL 81.2 174
310 See n18 above.
311 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Cor* at 15:27 PG 124 765B

Son and that the Son is not another power that is a hindrance and obstacle to the Father, and other matters of the same meaning.'

Augustine approves the same interpretation as cited in the *Ordinary Gloss*: 'Because as the Father,' he says, 'exists from nothing, so in no way can he be subject to anyone. For he is the beginning of all things.'[312] The same Augustine, cited by Bede[313] in collections of his works, wishes it to be understood that 'the Father put everything under the control of the Son, as in many places the Lord comments and preaches the same thing, not only because of the form of a servant, but also because of the beginning from which he is and from which he is equal to him from whom he is. For he loves to refer everything to one beginning,' etc.

According to this interpretation, which is based on orthodox authors, I will thus deal with my friend Sancho: Christ is subject to the Father according to divine nature, therefore according to that same nature he will be a servant of his Father. For Sancho taught us that to be subject is nothing other than to be a servant. In the interim I will not examine if Christ is a servant by the very fact that he is man, and by this very fact a subject because he is a servant, as in the end he is said to be a future subject, when he will have handed over the kingdom to God and the Father, as Sancho teaches us from the orthodox authors.

But Theophylact adds another interpretation from Gregory of Nyssa, that Christ should be said to be subject to the Father in his members since in his whole body there will be nothing to rebel against the Father – that will be in the resurrection of the dead.[314]

He whose commentaries under the name of Jerome are made on all the epistles of Paul[315] adds a third interpretation so that we may understand something about the nature of Christ, which seems frigid to me. For who does not know that his human nature was subjected to God? The same person indicates that at one time there were other interpretations of this passage.

It is clear, therefore, how Sancho achieves nothing with this weapon against me, who speak about certain and clear things. You have, reader, a

* * * * *

312 *Glossa Ordinaria* vol 4 at 1 Cor 15:27. Erasmus supplies the word *Pater*.

313 Not Bede, but Florus Diaconus of Lyon, *Expos in Epistolas Beati Pauli, ex operibus Sancti Augustini collecta*. De Jonge located the passage in the *Opera* of 'Bede,' Cologne 1563, tom. 6, col. 565–6, an excerpt from Augustine *De diversis quaestionibus* 83 1, qu. 69 6 PL 40 77.

314 Theophylact *Comm in 1 Cor* at 15:38 PG 124 768A

315 Ps Jerome *Comm in epistolas sancti Pauli* at 1 Cor 15:28 PL 30 798D–799A

summary of his standpoint, from which they tried to charge me with suspicion of adhering to the Apollinarist heresy.

Now let us expel selectively some cavils with which Sancho trifles with me in passing, as if indulging in a successful case. This witty and charming theologian from Alcalá, marvellously versed in dialectic, argues in this way with a blunt pestle. If this logical sequence were valid: 'I shall not call you servants,[316] therefore you will not be,' it would follow that Christ was not Christ, because he forbade his disciples to say that he was Christ.[317] As if there were some similarity here. If I promised myself that I would be silent about someone's adultery, he would nonetheless be an adulterer. But Christ indicated in what position he held them, and he added the reason. When that reason has been established, the effect follows. They cease to be servants because he who can manumit them no longer has them as servants. Otherwise, what benefit does he confer upon them if he merely does not call them servants, although in reality they are?

Even more frigid is what he adds: 'Unless Erasmus wishes, like one of the sophists whom he follows everywhere, to say that what only one singular person renders true is an indefinite utterance,' etc. What is it I hear? If someone should say: 'My pupils know Greek, but will it be a self-evident proposition if only one of all of them knows Greek? I wonder for what reason a theologian wants to toast himself with this kind of nonsense and be derided by the world.

After this he cites to me Job and other saintly men who were called servants, who themselves also spontaneously obeyed. But let him add that at times these men did not obey nor were they lacking in fear. And if they were lacking, what is this to me, if Holy Writ because of the dignity of Christ abstained from the word 'servant'? A servant who performs his duty through fear is not immediately bad, but he is a man of imperfect charity; when he has acquired charity, he will cease to be called a servant and will be called a freedman among men, a son with Christ. Sancho imagines that a servant is evil if he performs his duty with fear. On the contrary, 'the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord.'[318] And Peter is guided by another when he is old and he is led where he does not wish to go.[319] But on his part Sancho defines what a servant is. 'A servant,' he says, 'is defined as anyone who is constrained to acquiesce to another's will.' Who would so define it save

* * * * *

316 John 15:15
317 Mark 8:29–30; Matt 16:20
318 Ps 110:10
319 John 21:18

one who is accurately versed in dialectic? According to Paul sons and wives are ordered to obey their parents and husbands;[320] therefore are handmaids servants? The people are commanded to obey magistrates; therefore do they serve servitude? A hired man owes me work; is he therefore my servant?

But, poor me! Carranza is hurling another weapon against me: he teaches that the commentary of Ambrose goes against me.[321] If it is true that he says that Christ is not called a servant because he became man, but because as a sinner he was humiliated etc. Then he exhorts: 'Behold,' he said, 'that Ambrose does not deny that the appellation of servant fits Christ, but he does not want it to befit him as man, but inasmuch as he was humiliated, he accepted the injustices of human nature.' More precisely, Ambrose does not say that he was a servant but that he had taken on 'the form of a servant,' and a sinful servant. So then it was true affliction, but the false form of a sinful servant. He was not what he seemed, insofar as this quality is concerned but not insofar as his substance as man.

Again Sancho aims another weapon at me: 'In this form he obeyed the Father, preached, etc. 'He was therefore in such form truly a servant.' Let Sancho hear the contrary: if I order my son to make his way to France in a Franciscan habit and bring letters to a friend, will he suddenly become a Franciscan? If in war I disguise my identity and order my son to dress as a servant and conduct himself as a servant, then will he really be my servant if he obeys? I intersperse these examples for the sake of discussion since I ingenuously confess that there is nothing absurd if Christ according to his human nature is in some way called a servant.

But here again I am unfortunately in the shoals.[322] In the scholia to the epistle to the Philippians he says that the name of servant does not befit Christ,[323] and in the apology in which he answers Zúñiga he admits that it does befit him. If I had said that it does not befit him in any way, what Sancho alleges would have some significance, but I said it did not befit him according to the definition of servant that Ambrose brings forward there and which I approve.[324] Is it a contradiction to say that according to a geographic description the people of Brabant are French and at the same time to say that

* * * * *

320 Eph 5:22–4; 6:1; Col 3:18, 20

321 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7 CSEL 81.3 140:13–15

322 *Adagia* IV iii 70

323 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Phil 2:7

324 'Servants are created from sin as in the case of Ham, son of Noah, who first deservedly received the name of servant. It does not seem to me as it does to others that he so received the form of servant when he was born a man.' Ambrosiaster *Comm in Phil* 2:7

according to diction and language they are not French? So I said that Christ can be called and not be called a servant.[325] Is it a contradiction to say that a king should not be adored because only God is adored and is to be adored because we read that David and many others were adored when they were still dwelling on earth? And in the scholia, therefore, I am not the first to contend that Christ cannot be called a servant, but I follow the opinion of Ambrose, appending in the meantime the diverse opinion of Jerome, which however I do not reject nor do I argue against it. Nor do I recant it in the apology but say that I do not contend it.[326]

Furthermore, although neither here nor there is there any word that is redolent of contention, note nevertheless how magnificently Sancho says 'Since he denies with hands and feet[327] that the appellation servant befits Christ in the least degree.' Here is the man's cleverness. I do not examine meanwhile the man's dialectic, in which I admit I do not have the least competence. That is the way those talk who are engaged in scholastic theology for a long time.

Now since the difference of opinion depends on the different meaning of servant that I put forward in my apology, Sancho cries out that I am singing a palinode[328] and he describes it in words that are quite tragic. He says: 'Lest an orthodox man seem in some way to have fallen into the disgrace of the Apollinarists, who with great contention proclaimed that the word was made flesh in such a way that the word and the flesh are of one and the same substance, and for that reason they deny that Christ is called a servant, even according to the flesh, in the midst of his response he recants' etc. Here, Sancho betrays too much the juice of the black squid[329] and reveals the scenario of sham modesty. He who disputes about neither opinion does not contend with himself, nor does he who says different things for different reasons contend with himself. Just as if someone would call one who is playing the part of a king on stage a king, and the same person would deny that he is a king because he was not really a king. But truly, he will say, there were many things in Christ that gave the impression of a servant. For he truly suffered.

* * * * *

325 An example of his denying that Christ can be called a servant is Erasmus' annotation on Acts 4:27, 'And the appellation of servant does not befit him even if he obeyed and was subject to the Father in accordance with his assumption of human nature, but as a son, not a servant.' *Annot in Novum Testamentum* ASD VI-6 216:953–5.

326 'Nowhere do I contend that Christ cannot be called the servant of God.' *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 142:643, above, p 71.

327 *Adagia* III ix 68

328 *Adagia* I ix 59

329 *Adagia* II ii 56, based on Horace *Satires* 1.4.100

Truly, yes, but not for the same reasons. Those things are present in us from sin, but not at all in him. And therefore because the cause is different, the same effect does not follow. But what evil is this? Are all those who say that in some way the name servant is not fitting for Christ Apollinarists? Sancho taught us that every word used as an analogy is to be understood to have a more important meaning.[330] But 'servant' commonly means, above all, one who has been bought and forced to obey the command of his master. Whence come those proverbs against the shameless and the lowly. The Phrygian is corrected by blows,[331] a slave haircut,[332] a slave not worth his salt,[333] bought off the block.[334]

Or did anyone who said that in this sense the name of servant was not befitting for Christ agree with Apollinaris? What therefore did Chrysostom think, who says that the name servant is not befitting for Christ?[335] Did he say that he was not man? What did Ambrose think?[336] What of Lorenzo?[337] I do not doubt that there were many orthodox persons who had this opinion. But if no one suspects this opinion, who does not see that it is a malicious and shameless calumny to thrust this suspicion on me, in whose books there are countless passages that declare that I have a more correct opinion concerning Christ than perhaps Sancho himself? And yet in such a shameless matter Sancho declares a triumph by the decision of a public assembly[338] for his friend Zúñiga. 'And this,' he said, 'should suffice for Zúñiga to have him triumph gloriously in this passage.' O voice of theology! Let them prepare, let them prepare a solemn triumph for Zúñiga and let them sing to him: 'Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost and to Zúñiga. As it was in the beginning is now and always and for centuries of centuries. Amen.'

* * * * *

330 Erasmus is ridiculing Carranza's demonstration of his logical skills.
331 *Adagia* I viii 36, said of men who are suited by nature to be slaves
332 *Adagia* II iii 28, applied to people of boorish and uncivilized character
333 *Adagia* I vii 79, said of any barbarian and worthless creature
334 *Adagia* III I 67, applied to a worthless and utterly obscure man
335 Chrysostom *Hom in Heb* 3:1 PG 63 29 and 63 31. Also *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 140:603–5, above p 69, *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Phil 2:6 ASD VI-9 289 line note 225, *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Acts 4:27 ASD VI-6 216–18:947–92
336 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7-8 quoted in *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 142:647, 143:653, above p 71.
337 Valla *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Acts 4:27 *Opera omnia* (repr. Turin, 1962) I 848, col I
338 Erasmus jocosely uses the name of the assembly of the Roman people which decided capital issues.

But again I struggle with myself. In his tract against Lefèvre Erasmus admits that Christ can be called a servant and none the less be Lord of all things.[339] More precisely, I do not argue there that he is not truly a servant, but what is not denied by my adversary I choose to prove in my preamble. Just as if someone were convinced that the people of Flanders were Germans because they speak German, will the people of Hainault[340] not be French if they speak French?

I omit now the words Sancho recites from authors to show that Christ was called a servant according to the human nature that he had assumed. For this did not escape me and it is no secret that many are aware of this. Here he joins in concord Ambrose, Augustine, and Hilary, but I am excluded. Ambrose recognized, he says, that Christ assumed the form of a servant while he was scourged and died, which then revealed that he was a servant, although all the same he became a servant immediately after he was born.[341] What do I hear? If he is called a servant because he was born as a man, did he not adequately declare himself a man by being born? Rather, at that time there was no one who did not believe he was man, since they had not yet heard of his miracles and he was still considered the son of Joseph.

But I would gladly ask Sancho whether the name servant is fitting for Christ even now. If it is fitting, let him teach that it was attributed to him after he sat at the right hand of the Father. On the contrary, nothing not magnificent is attributed to him at that time.

But let us grant that this itself is the appearance of a servant, to be born weak, weeping, mortal. For these things are born of sin and from sin is born servitude, as Ambrose said.[342] These things reveal us truly as servants, who, want it or not, are born such, subject to the sin of our first parent. But in Christ, how could he be a true species of a servant, since there was no liability of sin? He could have been born immortal, liable to no evils of the body and the soul.

But this knotty man presses me. Ambrose lends no assistance to Erasmus for he acknowledges that the name servant in some way is fitting for Christ; this suffices against Erasmus, who thoroughly denies it. First, I showed that what Sancho asserts with hands and feet, and even elbows, I think, is false.

* * * * *

339 Carranza had quoted a passage from Erasmus' *Apologia ad Fabrum Stapulensem,* ASD IX-3 131:1147–50.

340 The people of Hainault, which is now in Belgium, spoke French.

341 The quotation is from Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7–8 CSEL 81.3 140:6–7 and 15–17.

342 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7-8 CSEL 81.3 140:14–15

Next, Ambrose does not say there that Christ is called a servant, but that he assumed a form.[343] If that form according to the explanation of servant that I gave is false, to have taken on form can be said, but to be called a servant is not possible.

He levels an even more grave charge, that I falsely cited the word of Ambrose from epistle 47.[344] Rather, Sancho threatens this falsely, forgetful of his theological modesty. First, he should explain whether he wishes that the word 'servant' be honorific or reproachful in Christ according to the world and the opinion of the crowd. For to seem to be a servant of God is honorific among the Jews. Therefore Ambrose did not recognize this in his epistle, which compares the name servant with other more grave reproaches that are attributed to him in the Scriptures, in which he is called the opprobrium of the people, a worm and no man,[345] sin, insult.[346] If, therefore, he assumed the form of a servant because of what he suffered, as a criminal and a sinner, and not when he was born, but when he suffered he bore the form of a servant. For so writes Ambrose in his letter: 'They do not notice that this is Christ's glory, that he assumed servitude in his body so that he could restore liberty to us. He bore our sins so that he could remove the sin of the world. As a servant he became a cursed sin on the cross so that you would cease to be a servant of sin.'[347] If, therefore, when Christ is bound, beaten, and crucified, he took on the form of a servant in his body, he did not immediately assume it when he was born according to this opinion. Is this not consistent with what he writes in the epistle to the Philippians?[348] Where, therefore, is my false citation?

But from these things, he will say, that Christ suffered, they assert the true substance of the flesh. Why should they not assert it, since he could not have suffered these things unless he were true man? Yet he could be man, immune all the same from these evils, as he is now. 'Let Erasmus see,' he says 'how falsely he cites Ambrose.' Rather, let Sancho see how easy it is to calumniate one's neighbour.

* * * * *

343 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7-8 CSEL 81.3 140:12–14

344 The letter in question is Ambrose *Ep* 7.39 CSEL 82.2 31:88–90. Erasmus had used it in *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 140:605–7, 142:627, and 144:667–80, above, pp 69, 70, and 72, in defence of his view that the word *servus* in Phil 2:7 referred to Christ's humiliation, not to the Incarnation.

345 Ps 22:6.

346 Ambrose *Ep* 7.39 CSEL 82.2 27–35

347 Ambrose *Ep* 7.39 CSEL 82.2 34–5

348 That is, Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7–8

But there remains a shameless and noteworthy error which I, poor soul, came upon because of my ignorance of the wonderful dialectics of which Sancho is so joyously proud. I had written,[349] I think, that Christ is called servant in the way in which one would say sin, malediction, opprobrium, but he was not called sin in virtue of the fact that he is man; therefore neither was he called servant inasmuch as he is man. Here he has quibbled quite a bit about his dialectic, which I do not mention, since it has nothing to do with me; in the end he teaches that Christ was called sin[350] because he was a victim; and he was a victim inasmuch as he died on the cross, and he died according to his human nature; therefore he was called sin because of his human nature and as man, which Erasmus, he says, denies. What am I hearing? I had barely added anything. Do I not say that Christ did not die according to his human nature, which not even Orestes[351] would deny? But discussing, not asserting, I deny that Christ was a servant for the reason that he is man, if he was only called servant because like a servant he was bound and killed, as Ambrose interprets. In the same way, someone might deny that Peter is learned inasmuch as he is Italian.[352] If he were learned for the reason that he was Italian, he would have been learned as soon as he was born. And so I believed that the relation of man and servant did not cohere in such a way that when one was mentioned the other would immediately follow.

But what you understand, he will say, you explained in ambiguous words. On the contrary, Sancho proclaims in ambiguous words, as becomes a contriver, while I have explained things in very clear words. Let Sancho hear my words: 'That heretic, I said, denied that Christ had really suffered. But truly he could not suffer unless he had been a real man. Insofar as he suffered he was called a servant, according to his human nature he suffered. Thus it comes about that he who does not admit that he truly suffered will deny that he was truly man. It does not immediately follow, however, that he was called a servant simply insofar as he was man. For he could be a man and still be exempt from afflictions and punishments. Indeed in the same epistle[353] he so wishes that Christ be called a servant that he was called sin, malediction, and opprobrium. These names did not fit him unless he had been man, and

* * * * *

349 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 144:676–9, above, p 72
350 2 Cor 5:21
351 After killing his mother, Clytemnestra, to avenge the murder of his father, Agamemnon, Orestes was pursued by the Furies and driven mad.
352 Ie Peter Lombard
353 Ambrose *Ep.* 7 39 CSEL 82 2:27–35

nevertheless they did not fit him inasmuch as he was man. For he could be man, but not sin.' I beseech you, reader, what could be said more clearly? And what less do I say than what Sancho pretends I said?

So then nothing that he collects from the authors goes against me,[354] how Christ was called sin, malediction or creature, except that the volume increases. Sancho would never have discovered my lapse if he had not been a crabbed dialectician. And the charming man laughs at my dilemma. For he makes a dilemma out of a lemma, as the people of Palestrina call a *ciconia* a *conia*.[355] You have, reader, a case successfully defeated by our Sancho.

Now as actors in plays interrupt the scenes with choruses to relieve the tedium of the audience, so this man, marvellously pleased with himself wherever he goes, inserts dialogues as if applauding himself, *καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν αὐλῶν*.[356] 'Let Erasmus go looking for another defender for himself who will protect him,' he said.[357] On the contrary, let Zúñiga seek out another protector for himself, for he has been so defended by his friend Sancho that it would be preferable to leave the case untouched.

And yet what is the reason why anyone ought to contend so bitterly. This is the situation: if a servant is said to be a constrained follower, obedient to another's will, I do not see why Christ according to his human nature is not called a servant of God. But if a servant is nothing other than a follower, as Paul frequently interprets, which is the service of idols[358] and 'whom I serve in spirit,'[359] it is honorific to say servant of God[360] or servant of Jesus Christ.[361] But if servant in itself means something servile, this is fear or wickedness, so that it is connected with a vice of the mind and has indignity, in no way does the word servant befit Christ. Even though according to this sense it would not be absurd to say that he took on 'the form of a servant,'[362] because the servant was considered disgraceful by many and worthy of punishment. But according to this reasoning he did not take on the form of a servant because he assumed man. But if the name servant sounds like

* * * * *

354 Carranza makes great use of Ambrose (including Ambrosiaster), Augustine and Chrysostom.
355 The Italian spelling is *cicogna*, 'stork.' The phrase is from Plautus *Truculentus* 691.
356 Plutarch *Moralia* 786C
357 Verbally quoted from Carranza
358 Gal 5:20
359 Rom 1:9
360 Titus 1:1
361 Rom 1:1
362 Phil 2:7

something humble and contemptuous, it would not seem very absurd to say that he took the form of a servant because by assuming human nature he lowered himself to the humility of our condition.

But up to now this is a game, now we must come to more alarming matters. It is worthwhile to hear with what a magnificent and severe *proemium* he enters upon the subject. 'What Erasmus says later,' he says, 'in my judgment requires greater censure and inspection, as one might expect, so that with his indulgence I would say that they are redolent of an Arian lie; but if Erasmus had been trained at one time in the palaestras of the Sorbonne and the exercises of the gymnasium, he would have pronounced his opinion more securely than many accuse his less than sober and pious pronouncements.' What do you say, reader? 'Did I say there is Attic eloquence in this?'[363] But he continues: 'There is no reason for Erasmus to mock me and tear me apart limb from limb with the fury of his eloquence, since perhaps that should be attributed to words not sufficiently premeditated by him and not to his faith, which I believe to be pure and sincere in this Christian man, as Paul preaches. I wanted to say these things not to assail Erasmus with my uncultured words, from whose lucubrations I have plucked the most abundant fruit, but that he cease in the future to insult and cease to harass and assail religious and pious men who have deserved well of the Christian religion, who, labouring strenuously in the field of God amply leave to us the most copious fruits in the doctrine of Christ, and that he then turn the arrows of his eloquence against pseudo-Christian heretics and enemies of the cross. Seeing that the impious Martin Luther is not lacking, not lacking are his conspiring supporters, against whom Erasmus rages, whom he overwhelms and thoroughly disperses with the torrent of his eloquence. May he not harass, mock, and despise others even if they are stammering and uncultivated and uncouth, as long as they are Christians. Let everyone have as much knowledge as he prefers as long as he knows Christ crucified[364] although he does not shine forth with as much brilliance in Roman eloquence as Erasmus. It is not given to everyone to go to Corinth,[365] or to seize the club from Hercules' hand.[366] For it did not please God to save his people through the sublimity of speech,'[367] etc, for this is sufficient to exhibit the flavour of this eloquence. I

* * * * *

363 *Adagia* I ii 57
364 1 Cor 2:2
365 *Adagia* I iv 1
366 *Adagia* IV i 95
367 1 Cor 2:1. Here ends the quotation from Carranza's pamphlet.

do not doubt that Sancho, while he wrote this, pleased himself superbly, even in the name of eloquence. But when it is necessary, I do not wish that anyone praise a man for his eloquence, but for simplicity of heart, for concealed erudition, for precise judgment, for prophetic comprehension.

But who are these people who labour in the field of the Lord whom I reproach, torment, stab, and tear to shreds? Or because at times have I called them theologasters? Sancho says this repeatedly to arouse ill-will against me, as if I call all scholastic theologians theologasters. On the contrary, if ever I observe those who, relying on some sophistic cleverness, think of themselves as great theologians, although they don't understand anything in the sacred volumes, I call them theologasters so that they don't think they are singled out as good theologians.

And he frequently adds in the name of the Sorbonne as if the Sorbonne theologians are condemned by me. On the contrary, if Sancho had spent time there, he would not have published these things in writing, which will not procure a very great name for their author. Do I attack theologians if I sometimes disagree with them? If it is a crime to attack those labouring in the vineyard of the Lord, why does he attack me in this way together with his friend Zúñiga? For I think I too should be numbered among those who to the best of their ability[368] have exerted themselves in sacred studies, especially when Sancho himself admits that he reaped very copious fruit from my books, although in the meantime he does not return very good profits to me.

And he incites us on against heretics and enemies of the faith. But in the meantime I am not given any free time by people like Zúñiga and Sancho to write against them. For they, abandoning everything else, attack me with so many soldiers, of this same type. Why doesn't Sancho himself exhibit this admirable talent against the impious Luther, except that the modest man roused up by zeal for the faith preferred to accuse Erasmus? Luther is not to be overwhelmed by eloquence nor destroyed by the barbs of insulting talk, but healed or refuted by sacred doctrine. But Sancho arrogates this doctrine to himself and takes it away from me. If I join battle with Luther, I will have no effect since Sancho and Zúñiga have persuaded the world that I know nothing about sacred Scripture. Grave censors, they deprive me of all dialectic, all philosophy, all knowledge of theology. They leave nothing to me but a little bit of agreeableness of speech. Do they want me to face lions and wolves unarmed? Or do they expect that I do battle with enemies of the faith and leaders of the faith at the same time? An agreement should have made

* * * * *

368 *Adagia* III viii 92

between us previously. Come now, therefore, putting aside contentions of this kind and civil wars, let us attack the heretics together. I for my part will quell those who adhere too much to the evangelical writings and are excessively averse to Judaism. Let Zúñiga and Sancho attack a different kind of heretics which has now associated itself too much with the Lord's harvest. More and more certain Jews are growing stronger, one-and-a-half Jews[369] and half-Jews, who, mixing in with us, bear the title of Christ although they have all of Moses in their breast.[370] 'Let us change shields and put on the insignia of the Danaans,'[371] they say. In this way they rather severely harm the Christian cause and there is more profit from calumny than from usury. No one will better defeat these people than López and Sancho.

But in the meantime let us shake off these words as a result of which we may be in danger from Sancho that we come under the suspicion that we are almost sympathizing with the Arians.[372] Rejecting the calumny of Sancho, I add these words of mine which he quoted: 'Christ obeyed and was subject to the Father according to his assumption of man, not as a servant but as a Son.'[373] In these words, lest there be anything which Sancho does not reprehend, he criticizes the colour of the language,[374] namely that 'according to his assumption of man,' which is said instead of what it was 'according to his assumption of human nature.' Sancho will concede this to me in speaking, which is conceded to ancient orthodox writers, who frequently speak in this way. This form of speech was not sought by me from the forum, as he said, but from the most approved authors, especially since it does not depart from the habitual usage of the Latin language, in which it is said that a man who departed human nature severed connections with man.[375]

* * * * *

369 In the sense of more Jewish than Jewish

370 Erasmus was averse to the excesses of formal scholasticism, which attended more to outward forms and subtle argumentation, which he suspected in the theology of Carranza and Zúñiga. He had condemned these sophistries in the *Enchiridion* ASD V-8, eg 82 and 198.

371 Virgil *Aeneid* 2.389–90

372 Erasmus quotes Zúñiga as saying that he (Erasmus) wrote that Christ obeyed and was subject to the Father as a Son, not as a servant, which according to him was redolent of Arianism. *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 142:630–1, p 70 above

373 Erasmus *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Acts 4:27

374 This is not true. In this passage Carranza was more interested in the content, not the style.

375 Cicero *De finibus* 5.33

But to get back to the subject, how could the error of Arianism fall upon me from some words or other uttered otherwise than Sancho wished, when so many passages abound in my books (indeed more than once in this apology in which I respond to Sancho) which teach that I mean something other than what Sancho interprets? But let us examine this double error that he imposes upon me from so few words. I say that Christ did not obey as a servant, but as a Son.[376] But in many places Augustine teaches that he was called servant inasmuch as he was man, 'therefore he obeyed as a servant.' This crux has been discussed by me previously. If Christ is called a servant by the very fact that he is a man and he began to be called a servant as soon as he was made man, Sancho speaks the truth. But what is this to me, who, following Ambrose, interpret the word servant differently?[377]

That is one error, but listen to another that is more atrocious. He blocks off any means of escape so that I cannot slip away if I say that I understand (which I clearly understand) that Christ admittedly obeyed, but the word servant did not immediately befit him because sons also obey. And Christ as a Son, not as a servant, obeyed the Father, that is, not through servility and fear but with the love of a son, willingly and eagerly. But Sancho cries out that I did not understand what I interpret. Therefore, what did I understand? That Christ was in no way a servant? On the contrary, in the apology itself I teach in what ways Christ can be called a servant and how he cannot.[378] He is not a servant, therefore he is not a man. If he is a servant by the very fact that he was made man, an enthymeme follows.[379] But Ambrose interprets otherwise, whom I followed there; I believe otherwise, since I keep in mind spontaneous and eager obedience, as is that of sons. And here, as he said, there is a negative error.

The affirmative error remains: 'Christ obeyed his Father as a son.' What danger is there if he obeyed out of love, not fear; if he was willing, not forced, did he not obey as a son? He says that this cannot be inferred from my words. But it is not inferred, it is explained. Let Sancho hear my words, which he

* * * * *

376 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Acts 4:27 ASD VI-6 216:954–5, 'He obeyed and was subject to the Father according to his becoming man, but as a Son, not as a servant.'

377 Ambrosiaster at Phil 2:7–8 CSEL 81 140, where *servus* is explained as referring to Christ's humiliation and passion, not to his incarnation.

378 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 146:693–9, above p 73

379 An enthymeme is a syllogism in which one premise is not explicitly stated. The logical conclusion here would be that since he is not a servant, therefore he is not a man.

saw in the apology: 'If a servant is one who through fear of trouble and by necessity of his condition fulfils his duty, it would be absurd to call Christ a servant; and not even we, whenever inspired by the spirit of sons, in which we cry out "Abba, Father,"[380] seek of our own accord things related to piety. But if an enslaved cultivator of the land and diligent executor of another man's will is called a servant, nothing prohibits Christ according to his human nature from being called a servant of God, but in such a way that nothing in the meantime forbids that same person according to the same nature to be called the Son of God, which he has willingly accepted not through fear, but through the ardour of love.'[381] One to whom these words are obscure will have blurred vision even in sunlight.[382] I say that the word servant is the name of fear and necessity, the children, of love. And in accordance with this meaning I remove the name of servant from Christ and attribute the name of son even according to human nature. He was a man and he suffered of his own accord and willingly. If we are called the children of God every time we do what is right of our own accord, much more is he.[383]

Here again Sancho plays the contriver: he recites my words perversely. I had written 'Christ is called the Son of God in two ways, by nature,' according to his divine nature, 'and by grace' according to his human nature.[384] He refers to them as if I made two sons out of one, a natural one and a willed or adopted one; and through the opportunity afforded by this word, which he combined with something of his own, he enters upon a very wide territory, discussing from various authors how Christ is called the Son of God by nature, not adoption, as we are because of adoption, not nature, as if it were a great thing to transcribe this sort of thing here from the books of the *Sentences*.[385] But now this was not the place for such matters since they have no effect against me. I merely said that Christ according to his divine nature is called the Son of God by nature, not by grace, but the same person according to his human nature is called the Son of God by grace. If this was false, let Sancho refute it, if it is very true, what does Carranza mutter so hatefully? Not by favour of adoption, but of assumption, he said. So be it, why does he sing me this song? I do not mention adoption, even if predestination or

* * * * *

380 Rom 8:15
381 Erasmus uses this biblical expression several times. See pp 200 and 227 ('by the impulse of charity').
382 *Adagia* II v 77
383 Luke 6:35; John 1:12, 11:52; Rom 8:19 and 23, 9:26
384 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 146:688–9, p 73 above
385 Peter Lombard *Sentences* III distinct. 10 4 PL 192 777

assumption can be said to be a kind of adoption. For what prevents adopting what is not yet conceived or born?

Nor did I ever say that Christ in all respects is called Son in the same way by grace as we are also. This is agreed upon between the two of us because he is called the Son of God as man by grace, and as man he obeyed willingly and by the impulse of charity, and according to this reasoning the name servant does not befit him, if he who is forced to obey obeys servilely. But if theologians say that Christ cannot be called the son of adoption, even according to his human nature,[386] it does not pertain to me who mention grace, not adoption. And if I had mentioned adoption there was no danger in the word since we have the same opinion concerning the matter.

Now whether the Son of God can be called God according to his having assumed man by nature and at the same time by grace, not even this pertains to me. I said that he is the Son of God by nature according to his divine nature. That which is generally admitted, that he can be said to be the Son of God by nature according to his human nature I have not denied. But if someone should say that Christ is the Son of God by grace of adoption,[387] as long as he understands the same thing as he who says that he is the Son by grace of the assumption of humanity, he would not have a heretical understanding nor would he speak very foolishly, in my opinion. For them[388] perhaps, Mary, the mother of Jesus, cannot be said to be the daughter of God by grace of adoption, citing the opinion of those who contend that she was conceived without stain of origin.[389] If, therefore, Christ is not called the Son of adoption, because he was never the son of wrath,[390] neither will his mother be called an adoptive daughter, because she was never the daughter of wrath. What forbids the predestination of assuming man, or the assumption itself, or as they prefer to speak, the unition,[391] from being called a certain adoption? But this is quite beyond the scope of my cause.

Therefore, although Sancho does not present here anything that goes against me even in the slightest, nevertheless listen to how magnificently

* * * * *

386 Peter Lombard *Sentences* III distinct. 10 4 PL 192 777

387 This is Erasmus' view.

388 Those theologians who denied that Christ could be called Son of God by adoption or by grace, among them Carranza

389 The doctrine of the immaculate conception was much disputed in the Middle Ages. It was developed by Duns Scotus and defended by the Franciscans, but not defined until 1854.

390 Eph 2:3

391 Cf n245

he entered upon the case, with how many reproofs he seasons his discussion, how triumphantly he closes it: 'If Erasmus had given heed to all these things previously, he would not have so easily pronounced that Christ was the adoptive Son of God, whether simply by grace and without limitation, seeing that we are taught by faith that Christ is the Son of God in one way, we in another way.[392] As always, he inculcates his adoption and invents things that were not said by me. But if I had said that Christ according to human nature was by grace the Son of God, as we are, it would be sufficient that a similitude consist in something. For so said Athanasius in his Creed: 'As the rational soul and the flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.'[393] This comparison is not valid in all respects.

Sancho continues to snarl: 'Every analogy is posited by itself,' etc. Therefore, every time the Son of God is said absolutely, the Son of God by nature is understood. 'But if sometimes they want to call Christ the Son of God by grace or adoption, they always add this limitation: Christ, inasmuch as he is man, is the Son of God by adoption or through grace.' So Sancho. And yet it is ridiculous always to add a limitation as long as what you are doing is evident by the continuity. When I say, 'The Son of God is equal to the Father and the Son of God is inferior to the Father,'[394] do I not indicate plainly the twofold nature? Later I add, 'Because Christ is called the Son of God for two reasons, by nature and by grace.'[395] Let Sancho hear 'twofold reason' and he has his limitation. And if this is not enough for that hard-of-hearing individual, this follows immediately: 'Nothing prohibits Christ from being called a servant of God according to his human nature, but in such a way that in the meantime nothing forbids that the same person is called the Son of God according to that same nature.'[396]

Although nothing more impudent or stupid than this calumny could be invented, yet like the dancing camel[397] he jests as if the affair were well conducted, asking whether I have a different grammar or a different dialectic than others. And to testify that he is a dialectician, he thus defines servant: a servant 'is an enslaved cultivator of the land and executor of the will of

* * * * *

392 Quotation from Carranza.

393 The Athanasian Creed, which stresses the affirmation of the Trinity, is no longer ascribed to Athanasius. It was written in Latin. The phrase that seems to be referred to here is: 'ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.'

394 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 144–6:686–7, p 73 above

395 Ibid 146:687–8, p 73 above

396 Ibid 146:697–9, p 73 above

397 *Adagia* II vii 66

his master.' But he added cautiously here: 'his master.' Otherwise the definition fits the Son also. But by adding the word master, there was no need for these words in the middle: 'an enslaved cultivator of the land and executor of the will.' It is enough to say: a servant is one who has a master. But here it is a question of whether the word servant is attributed to Christ or whether Christ ever calls his Father Lord, not that this cannot be the case in any sense, but that the law of the gospel, which is of grace, puts more emphasis on the name 'sons' rather than 'servants' even when it speaks of us, because the vulgar use of this word has the meaning of fear and necessity, which does not befit Christ. For what Sancho said, that the one who obeys through fear of evil is called the bad servant, let him see whether this is always true. Certainly Paul, eager to form good servants, bids then to be compliant towards their masters with fear and trembling.[398] And Christ himself in the gospel calls a servant wicked who, not obeying the will of his master, had buried the talent in the ground.[399]

What of the fact that not even the son immediately loses his name if, not yet perfected in charity, he has an admixture of fear? While sons are still boys they are entrusted to a pedagogue, but the more they approach the image of servants, the more they need fear of the pedagogue.[400] But I would not even dare to attribute a filial fear of this kind to Christ, so far is he from the name of servant according to the common meaning of servant.

In the end Sancho, having become a teacher from a jester, teaches how I could escape all these atrocious suspicions. If, he says, Erasmus had affirmed: 'Christ obeyed and was subject to the Father according to his assumed human nature, not through servile but filial fear.' Such a small thing could save me from the suspicion of so many heresies. On the contrary, what else did I say except that I spoke Latin?[401] Is nothing pious to such an extent except that it be barbarous? Whoever answers servilely is said to answer as a servant, whether he is a servant or not. The Son was said to have obeyed the Father;[402] lest from this statement anyone say that he was a servant because he obeyed, I showed his double obedience, that of a servant and of a son.

* * * * *

398 Eph 6:5
399 Luke 19:22; Matt 18:32
400 Gal 3:25
401 Erasmus is subtly reproving Carranza for the use of the word *filiali*, which is a late Latin word.
402 Phil 2:8

'He obeyed,' I said, 'but as a Son,'[403] that is, as a son obeys a father, evidently through the love and affection of piety, not as a servant, that is, through necessity and fear.

Finally when he assembled many things from the books of Augustine arguing against the Arians,[404] which do not pertain to me in the least, why waste many words? In short, I laughed at my stupidity for responding to such inanities. And what these two try to capture gives off a slight whiff. They consider it a prize of great worth if they merely become known and are said to have given Erasmus a hard time. I am not unaware of those who instigate the actors of this play. It is a pharisaic race and the remnants of the Ebionites.[405] Let it suffice for the Jews to have killed Christ once; because nothing they threatened has remained, lest it come back to life. The tomb was sealed;[406] guards were assigned but he eluded their evil counsels victoriously. Christ dies no more; now seated in heaven, he derides these people and ridicules their stupid efforts, which will make no progress except for their own destruction.

We would accomplish something more worthy of the name of theology if we made an effort to deserve to be called the servants of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom Paul said, 'It is not fitting that the servant of the Lord should quarrel,'[407] rather than that we contend with each other in such bitter trickeries whether Christ can be called servant, especially since here there is no suspicion of impiety but it is only a question of the habitual practice of sacred Scripture. First of all, it is one thing to say servant without qualification, another thing to say servant of God or servant of Jesus Christ. For the name servant used without qualification commonly denotes indignity and vileness of condition; for which reason formerly more polite masters do not call their servants servants, but boys. And from those whom they discovered to be gifted with a liberal character they remove for the sake of honour the name of servant and instead of servants call them freedmen. 'Minister' denotes a temporary function, as for Paul the Lord Jesus is called a minister of the New

* * * * *

403 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* ASD VI-6 216:954–5; *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 142:610, p 69 above

404 Carranza quotes extensively from Augustine *Contra Maximinum Arianum* PL 42 743–814

405 The Ebionites were a sect of Jewish Christians in the early centuries of the Christian era. They adhered to the Mosaic law; see also n81.

406 Matt 27:66

407 2 Tim 2:24

Testament.[408] And those who are prefects of the king are said to administer a province. And we read that the angels are called ministers,[409] not servants. 'Servant' usually denotes the continuous condition which is usually associated with a lowly frame of mind and the necessity rather than the will of obeying. For these reasons it has been decided by not unworthy authors that the name of servant does not befit Christ.[410]

How is it agreed that though theologians fear to say that Christ is an adoptive son they maintain that he should be called a servant, although an adoptive son is far more honourable even than a freedman. For he who says that someone is a servant ipso facto says that he is not the son of a freeborn man of whom he is the servant. For if anyone interprets the word servant to mean the lowliness of the human condition, which our cause has deigned to assume, Christ is rightly said to be a servant by the fact that he is a man. But whether this is so in the divine Scriptures has not been established up to now among orthodox writers. Then again, if one wishes to call him a servant because he was fettered for our sins, killed, and crucified, he took on the form of a servant[411] for the time being, which was true to this extent, that he had the true nature of man, according to which he truly suffered, but to this extent false because as an innocent man he was condemned and took the role of sinners unto himself, although he was the author and font of innocence. Once again if a servant is understood as a devoted cultivator of the land or the executor of another person's will, it does not seem to be any impiety to call Christ the servant of God according to his assumption of human nature. Furthermore, if anyone understands that a servant is unrelated to the dignity and love of a son, since he performs his duty more out of fear than from his heart, you see how far removed is the dignity of Jesus Christ from this name; and yet this commonly means without qualification the attributed name of servant. For which reason I do not think the name of servant is attributed to any of the saints in holy Scripture. We read 'my servant';[412] we read 'servants

* * * * *

408 This is erroneous. Paul never calls Jesus a 'minister' of the New Testament, but a 'mediator of the New Testament,' Heb 12:24.

409 Heb 1:7

410 One example is cited in the *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 141:603–5, p 69 above, viz, Chrysostom *Hom in Heb* 3 at 1, 6–8 PG 63 253–4.

411 Phil 2:7

412 Not in the New Testament, but in Isa 41:8, 44:1; Hag 2:24

of God';[413] but when it is a question of the unqualified meaning of the name, Paul says we are not servants, but sons.[414]

Many theologians want the name 'adoptive son' to be excluded because of the unition,[415] as they call it, of his human nature. And why for all the more reason does that unity not exclude the name servant, especially since there is no kind of insulting language in the name, adoptive son, but only a lower degree of dignity? If someone is adopted, he is adopted for the sake of honour, and if perhaps he is a servant, he becomes free by the very fact that he is adopted. No one is subjected to servitude for the sake of honour, but one is manumitted for the sake of honour. But it is better, discarding these, to have done with a third topic.

<From chapter 5 to the Ephesians>

The annotation of Diego López Zúñiga to the annotation of Erasmus from chapter five of the epistle to the Ephesians. The old translation: 'This is a great sacrament.'[416] Paul: *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτον μέγα ἐστίν* (This is a great mystery). Erasmus: *Mysterium hoc magnum est.* And in the annotations 'This is a sacrament, *μυστήριον*, that is, a mystery.' I did not want those who from this passage make matrimony one of the sacraments not to know it. Not that there is any doubt about it, but that it cannot particularly be deduced from this passage. If it is really possible that the adversative particle, 'but I,' is sufficient indication that this 'great mystery' pertains to Christ and to the church, not to husband and wife. For it is not a great sacrament in this regard, if a man is joined to a wife, which has customarily been done even among pagans.

Zúñiga: What in Greek is called *μυστήριον*, that is, mystery, in Latin is called *sacramentum*, nor do the Latins have another word except for this by which to express the Greek word, which signifies exactly what is understood by *mysterium*. Those who make matrimony one of the sacraments from this passage do not seem to be in error since it is not only very clearly called a sacrament here, but also a great sacrament. For when the Apostle was dealing here with the joining of man and wife and comparing carnal matrimony to mystic matrimony, that is, to that which exists between Christ and the

* * * * *

413 Acts 16:17; Apoc 7:3
414 Gal 4:6–7
415 *Unitio* is a technical term invented by the dialecticians. See n245 above.
416 Eph 5:32

church, he had ordained to wives that they be subject to their husbands,[417] as the church is subject to Christ; and taught that husbands and wives should love each other as Christ loved the church;[418] and immediately subjoined the divine precept about marriage, that is, 'for this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two will be in one flesh.'[419] He added appropriately, 'This is a great sacrament,' that is, this sacrament of matrimony and mutual association of man and wife is indeed great since it has been instituted by God; but nevertheless I refer it to Christ and the church. As if he were to say that what is literally said of carnal matrimony can be said spiritually of a mystic matrimony. That this is the true meaning of the apostolic words we are taught by the holy doctors, and primarily by Athanasius, who, commenting on the present passage said: 'For this must be truly called a sacrament so that a man deserts those who generated him [ie his parents] and who suffered labours and troubles in generating and raising him, and conferred innumerable kindnesses, and attaches himself to a woman whom he had never seen before, and who herself had never brought anything good before. Otherwise I have accepted whatever regards this sacrament was even said prophetically of Christ. For he had left the Father not by a physical departure but by a condescension to the flesh, and came to his spouse, who previously was unknown to him, and was united to her in spirit. For he who adheres to the Lord acquires one spirit with him. Why therefore are weddings repudiated when Paul brings them forward as a proof of the divine sacrament and calls them by the name of sacrament?'[420]

Ambrose, elucidating these words of the Apostle, said: 'It signifies that there is a great sacrament of mystery in the unity of man and woman. But he does not transmit this, but demands another reason which does not differ from the cited mystery, which he knows pertains to the profit of the human race, that is, of the church and the Saviour, so that the man, after leaving his parents, adheres to his wife, and thus abandoning all error, adheres to the church and subjects himself to its head, which is Christ.' So Ambrose.[421]

So great is this sacrament of the joining of man and wife that if pagans were joined together in marriage and afterwards were converted to the

* * * * *

417 Eph 5:22
418 Eph 5:25
419 Eph 5:31
420 Theophylact *Comm in Eph*, 5 32 PG 124 1117D–1120A. This passage is taken from Diego López Zúñiga *Annotationes contra Erasmum* (Alcalá 1519).
421 Ambrosiaster CSEL 81.3 119:13–21

faith of Christ, they would remain in the marriage previously contracted, and would not be obliged to contract marriage again or to be blessed in the church. And what is more important, even if they were joined in their manner in a degree of relationship prohibited by canon law, once converted to the faith they are in no way separated. And this is so because, as the sacred canons dictate, the sacrament of marriage exists between the faithful and infidels, as the Apostle shows, saying: 'If any brother has a wife who is an unbeliever and she agrees to live with him, he should not divorce her.'[422] Ignoring this, Erasmus of Rotterdam in his annotation on this passage says: 'For neither in this is it a great sacrament if a man is joined to a woman, which was accustomed to be done also among the pagans.'[423]

The response of Des. Erasmus of Rotterdam to the annotations of Diego López Zúñiga from chapter five to the Ephesians[424]

Here Sancho like an excellent actor in the last act plays the part of the outstanding performer. For although in the first edition I testified that I sympathize with those who include marriage among the seven sacraments of the church, and although I profess the same thing in several places elsewhere (but what I declare openly cannot be completely proved from this passage, Sancho admits that to be so true that he adds that it cannot be sufficiently deduced from any passage in the sacred volumes), nevertheless he acts with such malicious ingenuity as if this passage could provide Luther with an opportunity to deny that matrimony is a sacrament, and he pretends to feel doubtful whether I will agree with him. He says: 'Therefore we can oppose the Lutherans on this point with no words more clearly, or Erasmus, if he agrees with Luther in this.' O theological brow! In more than ten passages and in the very words which Zúñiga cites against me from the first edition I declare my opinion. It flies about through the hands of everyone and the poem on the seven sacraments of the church is read aloud to boys in the schools,[425] in which I join matrimony to baptism because just as we are born through marriage, so through baptism we are reborn. I drive it home so many

* * * * *

422 1 Cor 7:12

423 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* ASD VI-9 258:405–6

424 This is an abbreviated formulation for what should read: *Response to Sancho Carranza's defence of the* Annotations *of Diego López Zúñiga*.

425 The *Christiani hominis institutum* (Basic principles of Christian conduct) CWE 85 Carmen 49.93–107

times arguing against Lee.[426] I do the same in my *Encomium of Matrimony* and in innumerable other places.

What we call sacraments in Dionysius are called by no other name than mysteries, that is secrets especially in sacred matters.[427] Among the Latins a sacrament is said to be more an oath or a religious obligation, as used by a judge to declare a sentence or by which a soldier is bound by oath to an emperor. Or would the sacraments of the church perish if anyone called them by the Greek word 'mysteries'?

If such a small thing provided an opening for Luther, that I translate mystery instead of sacrament, why did it not rather restrain him because in the same passage[428] I profess that it is not to be doubted that it is a sacrament of the church? What motivated him to repudiate the rest of the sacraments also, with one or two exceptions? The sacred canons,[429] he said, accepted this sacred word sacrament, therefore Erasmus should not have changed it. I would assent if he would deduce: therefore Erasmus should not have found fault. And I myself in so many places call them sacraments. What danger is there if I teach Latins the emphasis of the Greek word? For there are a great number of Latins who understand the Greek word more than the Latin, so accepted is Greek diction.

But at this point be alert, reader, to deal with the new trick of the man. Responding to Zúniga I had taught that the word sacrament covers a wide field, so that it applies to everything that is a sign of some sacred thing, sometimes received with a 'particular meaning so that a sacrament consists of a visible sign of a sacred thing, but which necessarily, as through an agreement, is accompanied by invisible grace.'[430] But then I add: 'Peter Lombard, and with him older theologians, do not number matrimony among the sacraments of the church that are properly designated by this name; more recent theologians began to include it, with whom I gladly agree.' And here Sancho derides me quite falsely: he wonders 'with what spirit' I denied that this was said by Peter Lombard, which, nevertheless, he actually said. What did Peter Lombard, the shameless mouth, say? He said that it should be numbered

* * * * *

426 *Responsio ad annot Ed. Lei* ASD IX-4 242-8

427 Ps Dionysius Areopagita *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 5.1.5. PG 3 505B. He uses the term *μυστήριον* for the sacrament of the Eucharist, but not for matrimony.

428 *Annot in Novum Testamentum* at Eph 5:32 553; ASD VI-9 254–6:383–6

429 To defend the sacramental character of matrimony Carranza had quoted the canons of the ecumenical Council that was held in Basel, Ferrara, Florence and Rome, 1413–45.

430 *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 210:780–2, p 121 above

among the signs of sacred things.[431] But he said that a peculiar or sacramental grace is not conferred by it. Therefore he said that it is not to be numbered among the sacraments with the proper quality that recent theologians attribute to the seven sacraments.

I explained what kind of sacraments I was talking about; but if I had not explained it, that maxim certainly should have been valid for Sancho: 'every analogy presented by itself,' etc.[432] What is the point, therefore, of that stupid remark about my arena,[433] in which I boast that I am involved? Let Sancho take care that he does not fall out of the theological arena but out of his mind. I beseech you, to whom does Sancho think he is writing, to beasts or to men? If these things were read in translation into the vulgar tongue by idiots, what would they say of this theologian, who so arrogantly raises his eyebrow?[434] I do not boast that I am a philosopher, or a theologian, or a dialectician, but if I feel like it, I have enough of these things to answer Sancho. But I do not intend to contend with such a person unless he produces something more learned or more sane. These things are worthy of neither a learned nor an honest nor a decent man.

As to what Sancho argues, that I cleverly cited the words of Augustine[435] who wrote that the joining of man and woman is not a great sacrament although the same writer later testifies that it is great in Christ and the church, I deal with this passage more amply in my response to Lee.[436] I admit that there is nothing great in the *res significans,* but in the *res significata*[437] there is a great mystery. Augustine understood this since it is probable that he did not believe that matrimony was a sacrament according to the peculiar reasoning

* * * * *

431 Peter Lombard *Sententiae* IV.2.1 PL 192 841–2. He went on to say that it acts only as a remedy, 'in remedium tantum est,' in the sense of the prevention of fornication, not as one of the sacraments of the church, which strengthen us with grace and virtue.

432 Cf n329 above.

433 In his *Apologia contra Stunicam* ASD IX-2 210:276–7 Erasmus had remarked that Zúñiga was not operating in his territory, as it were, when discussing the sacraments. Carranza retaliated, turning this expression against Erasmus.

434 *Adagia* I viii 49

435 Augustine *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* PL 44 427; Augustine says precisely that what is a great sacrament in Christ and the church is the least great sacrament in individual husbands and wives, but it is nonetheless a sacrament of an inseparable union.

436 *Responsio ad annot Ed. Lei* ASD IX-4 245–6:145–76

437 The *res significans* is matrimony, the *res significata* the relation between Christ and the church.

of recent theologians. Otherwise, when he diligently summarizes the benefits of it, he would have also mentioned sacramental grace. But if for him according to this reasoning it is not even a sacrament, how will it be a great sacrament? And yet up to now this grave, modest, sober, prudent theologian, philosopher, dialectician, in short, of no matter how great worth defends his Zúñiga theologically and scholastically, without any abusiveness, with no desire to harm.

Now let us hear how he says 'farewell and give me your applause' to his theatre. He said: 'These are the things I wished to make public in uncouth and uncultivated language in passing and extempore, deprived of the solace of my books,[438] not to calumniate Erasmus, but rather with the intention of reminding him that taking in good part these passages that seemed worthy of further discussion, he might correct his opinion and embrace the Catholic truth, if I am the man who deserves to obtain this from Erasmus. For I know how scarce and imperfect are my own abilities. So far is it from my opinion to make so much of myself that, barely literate rather than learned, I should wish to challenge the most well deserving personage in all literary learning to descend into the arena with me. I know without question that Erasmus will not only not be angry with me but will be courteously grateful, since I pointed out to him with the most friendly and benevolent feelings the things that his detractors who envy his success can levy against him. It will be his duty, if he will deign to do so (which I pray in the name of sacred theology), to liberate his way of thinking from the suspicion of error.' Here ends the peroration of Sancho.

How inconsistent is a speech that does not proceed from the heart, although I taught him that through perverse interpretation sometimes and with supreme impudence one is drawn to calumny, although he rages against my person with so many insipid jokes; although he handled the matter very badly; although he has nothing on his tongue except Arians, Apollinarians, Patripassians, Noetians, and Sabellians; although he never cites more recent theologians without adding invidious praise by which he stirs up envy against me, as if I totally condemn all more recent theologians as if they were crabbed and full of briars. He often recalls the Sorbonne with quite a bit of affection, as if I condemn everyone at the Sorbonne, although I love and venerate many exceptionally learned men there and venerate those that school gave us. Although they are far different than Sancho, nonetheless they do not despise Erasmus as he wishes to seem to despise him. Once he cited Scotus

* * * * *

438 He was in Rome at the time he wrote this, not in Alcalá.

and Thomas; he added, 'But their authority is little or nothing with Erasmus.' He frequently desires I had skill in dialectic, often in scholastic theology, as if only he had learned these things, nor could we cite something from Peter Lombard, whom he declares, with a considerable contempt for others, as the only one after the apostles who was worthy of the name of teacher, although there are more condemned articles in his books than in all of my volumes, although I never deal overtly with theological matters.

In addition, although I teach in apologies that Zúñiga has so evidently fallen into error in many places, he always appositely cites authors; there is nothing he does not perceive; he is most learned in any subject whatever, from childhood he was versed in sacred letters. Erasmus cites everything falsely, sees faultily everywhere. And if Sancho ever cites something from the master of the *Sentences*,[439] as if only he could do so, he says: 'Let Erasmus hear this,' even when there is nothing that pertains to me. Finally, in the case of matrimony when I openly dissent from Luther, he tries with sycophantic skill to join us together, emanating considerably less hatred against Luther than me, by whom he was never harmed by a single word, from whose books he admits that he derived much benefit.

Last of all, although he wishes that what he charged against me seems to be closely related with the error of the Sabellians, Arians, and Apollinarists, nevertheless he indicates that there are many other things that require more accurate discussion and exhorts me to correct my opinion and embrace the Catholic truth.

While the whole book abounds with these poisons, still he paints some things with honey, either wishing to mock us with a scurrilous impudence or thinking that the reader will be so stupid that he will not understand these pretences. He so defends his friend Zúñiga, whose cause he did not benefit, yet he commended the man himself through comparison with himself. To whoever reads these things Zúñiga will seem both the more learned and less petulant and virulent and of a more straightforward temperament. For he (Zúñiga), openly slanderous, candidly exhibits eagerness for glory in his demeanour, and he challenged Erasmus for no other reason but that in the taverns of the booksellers this title would be read all over, written in six-feet-high letters:[440] 'Diego López Zúñiga versus Erasmus.' The same cupidity has taken hold of Sancho, but he does not disguise the evil of his mind with so

* * * * *

439 Ie Peter Lombard in his *Liber Sententiarum*

440 As a matter of fact, the title of his *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* was printed in gigantic letters.

many pretences as the other does. But how it savours of theological simplicity that although they both write at the same time against the same person in the same city, perhaps in the same bedroom, nevertheless in the preface he writes in this manner: 'I hear Zúñiga is contemplating a bitter recrimination against him.' How worthy this is of a theological sense of shame that they call my apology, in which I politely respond to Zúñiga's virulence, an accusation! From this I fear that this apology too, by which I repel a false suspicion of heresy threatened by the most modest of theologians, will be an accusation against him, yet I do not retaliate the calumny. For in what I am about to say, I have no doubt that Sancho will imagine that he is remarkably genial, since in this not very big book which he wanted to be the first fruits of his fame,[441] and ready to censure or calumniate, which is very easy, he is so often faulty and shamefully falls into error. While this is perhaps to be pardoned for one trying to teach, it is utterly disgraceful for one playing the censor with such haughty demeanour.

He ironically calls me in some places all-seeing. First of all, what was the point of this joke since I profess nothing more everywhere than that I am a man, and occasionally make mistakes. Furthermore, how fitting was it for this to be said by him, who in his trivial little book included so many conspicuous lapses. These altercations, this captiousness, this desire to find fault with everything, defamatory pamphlets of this kind, in which there is neither any utility, nor pleasantness, alienate the minds of men from the study of theology. For who would not judge that it would be better to read through Cicero or Virgil than unlearned and disagreeable gibberish of this kind? These men are to be blamed if the schools of theology are languishing anywhere. Wherefore I will beseech Sancho in turn for the sake of sacred theology, of which I am an unsophisticated practitioner and he a leader, that after this he will both not expose himself to scorn with such foolish, unlearned, acrimonious, and fraudulent little books and incite hatred among learned men against the theological class and bring dishonour to his Spain and its Alcalá Academy among the unlearned. Spain at one time abounded with learned men and today has begun to return to its pristine glory. The Alcalá Academy, I hope, will one day bring forth more genuine theologians after it has aborted Zúñiga and Sancho for us.

Let him temper his pen so that the judicious and upright reader may understand that the book emanated from a learned, sincere, and virtuous theologian, and let him not flatter himself with this prize, that he wrote against

* * * * *

441 Actually, Carranza already had quite a few books to his credit.

Erasmus. And let him ponder within himself in this fashion: such odious words either will not be read, or they will be read languidly, or they will be read by those who wish ill to Erasmus. I will please the malevolent more, the more reprehensibly I write, to whom it will be a pleasure whatever trouble is given to the man. To the rest I will appear to be something great since I did not hesitate to engage in an altercation with him, and that in Rome, as if there were a greater opportunity of behaving like a madman elsewhere. I will disregard the learned, the upright, and those who wish well to Erasmus. I prefer to be commended by more people rather than by the more honourable. Let this thought be absent from the breast of a theologian, especially one from the school of Alcalá. There is not such a great paucity of judicious men as Sancho thinks. If he will obey my friendly advice, we will not envy him whatever name he acquired for himself in this first little encounter. But if he will continue to be unchanged he will not have me as a rival. And yet I fear that his Bacchius will not be lacking to Bithus.[442] We prefer to devote good hours to helping public studies rather than to womanish disputes of this kind. He is indignant that I devoted only seven days to the sacrosanct annotations of Zúñiga, and that in such a sacred affair I did not call together a senate of friends. I regretted more than once that I spent three hours on the rubbish either of the former or the latter.[443]

The end.

* * * * *

442 *Adagia* II v 97 Bacchius and Bithus were two gladiators, a good match in skill and courage. They were the model of two people who will not yield to each other in a contest.

443 Ie Zúñiga and Carranza, respectively

APOLOGIA AGAINST THE WORK OF DIEGO ZÚÑIGA ENTITLED 'BLASPHEMIES AND IMPIETIES OF ERASMUS'

Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi

translated and annotated by
STEPHEN RYLE†

reviewed by
CHARLES FANTAZZI

(ASD IX- 8 119–169; LB IX 355–375)

APOLOGIA AGAINST THE WORK OF DIEGO ZÚÑIGA ENTITLED 'BLASPHEMIES AND IMPIETIES OF ERASMUS'

Scarcely had my dispute with Carranza ended, when lo and behold, Zúñiga's pamphlet, by far the most violent, suddenly appeared, like a wolf that would have robbed me not only of my voice but also of my sanity,[1] if I had not had an earlier sight of Zúñiga, who was by now not unknown to me.[2] In any case, wouldn't anyone's 'dear heart' have sunk into his boots,[3] even at the very title, if he did not know that Zúñiga was its author? The first page displayed this title in six-inch high letters: 'Blasphemies and impieties of Erasmus of Rotterdam, now for the first time made public, and in a separate volume elsewhere refuted, by Diego López Zúñiga.'[4] Next comes a Preface, rattling on the whole time about 'blasphemies, impieties, madnesses, outrages, heresies, poisons, serpents, Luthers', and other more than fateful names.[5] Wondering whether this was meant seriously or was intended as a joke, I read one or two chapters. When I found that there was nothing there that was promised by the title and preface, I began to wonder even more whether the man was playing a game with me, or was in collusion with the Lutherans. But the spirit in which he has written is his own affair: this I know, that for a long time now nothing has appeared that has given greater pleasure to certain extreme Lutherans (there are those who cause grave annoyance and harm to Luther

* * * * *

1 *Adagia* I vii 86 'The wolves have seen him first.' According to the saying, if the wolves have seen a man before he sees them, he loses his voice.

2 The apologia against Carranza was written in May 1522. Zúñiga's *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* appeared between 7 April and 4 May of that year. Erasmus' reply, this apologia, was ready before 13 June.

3 *Adagia* I viii 70. In Greek the phrase for 'dear heart,' *φίλον ἦτορ*, occurs more than fifty times in Homer.

4 A single manuscript copy of this work is preserved in the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emmanuele in Naples. The book was never published. Leo X forbade the publication of the original, unabridged version.

5 This Preface is quoted in this apologia, below, pp 278–9

by the very fact that they are immoderate Lutherans); and, as I have learned from the letters of friends, Zúñiga's slander has been of great value to them, since they had already prepared a number of pamphlets with a view to tearing me to pieces.[6] However, when they saw that Zúñiga had left out nothing that might serve to bolster their faction, they took the view that their own work would be pointless, and decided that it was more sensible to exploit someone else's madness than to publish their own. They had made up their mind, so I hear, to avenge themselves on me in two ways for my tenacious refusal to take sides, by covering me with abuse and by indulging their own desires; and then having brought forward some passages from my books, in which I appeared not to dissent too much from the law laid down by Luther, since Zúñiga's 'Blasphemies and impieties' had unexpectedly issued forth from Rome (which has recently begun to take over the reputation of Africa as the constant source of bad news): furthermore, from all my printed works annotations were made on extracts that might bring me into ill repute, either with the Roman pontiff, or with the cardinals and bishops and clergy, or with the monks (a group by no means to be treated lightly), or with kings and nobles, or finally with singers and musicians. No doubt, they realized that all the kudos in this area had been snatched from them, since this artist seemed clearly to have been born to play this role.

However, just as Zúñiga gained great favour with these people through his pamphlet, so he incurred the greatest possible hostility on the part of all scholars and right-thinking people, who long for this worldwide schism to be brought to an end, who bear genuine good will towards the dignity of the Roman See and of the clergy, and who also desire to see the study of the classical languages and literature succeed, as well as a purer theology,[7] which for some time has been on the point of coming to life again.

And so while a plan was being set in motion for this brood of vipers[8] emanating from Zúñiga to burst forth into the daylight at Rome, the cardinals issued an edict forbidding the publication by anyone of anything that

* * * * *

6 For these pamphlets, Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-8 121 line note 19) refers to remarks in Epp 1263, 1267, 1268, 1274, 1276 and 1278, all written between 7 March and 25 April 1522.

7 'Purer theology,' ie the theology based on philological scriptural research, or Erasmus' 'philosophy of Christ,' a pure religion of good behaviour towards one's neighbour based on the Gospels and the Pauline letters as written down in the *Enchiridion* (CWE 66 1–128).

8 Ie the first version of Zúñiga's *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates*, which he completed in 1521 and was not allowed to be published.

slanderously assailed the name of Erasmus.[9] Indeed, Leo X, when he realized that Zúñiga was circulating throughout Rome those notorious *Annotations*[10] in which he had first poured out his venom against me, was pressing them upon people willy-nilly, and was threatening even more elaborate onslaughts,[11] warned him not to employ the same kind of malice against Erasmus; or, if he had any difference of opinion with him, to express it in such a moderate tone that he should be seen to be serving the truth, and not indulging in envy or the vice of slander.[12] But just as the supreme pontiff's warning counted for nothing with him, so the cardinals' edict was treated with contempt, not so much by Zúñiga himself as by certain wearers of phylacteries,[13] who, after setting this drama in train over many years, finally after much effort obtained a star performer answering to their prayers. These people, despite arrogating to themselves a tyrannical power over everyone through the smokescreen of papal authority, are yet, whenever it is to their advantage, so contemptuous of his authority, as if they did not believe any of the things that they try to convince the world of in their books concerning the power of the Roman Pontiff and of which they are actually confident they have convinced quite a number. And so through their agency – they can get away with anything – the book[14] was secretly printed, and was already beginning to flit from hand to hand. When this became known the cardinals' edict was renewed and it was forbidden to be circulated. One would scarcely believe that any of the cardinals took such account of me that they should have been concerned to protect my reputation in two edicts. Among the cardinals there are also those who understand that Erasmus has deserved better of literature and Christianity than to be handed over with impunity to

* * * * *

9 Erasmus states several times that the college of cardinals prohibited the printing of both the first version and a much more abbreviated version, eg in Epp 1302, 1415 and 1581, as Henk Jan de Jonge verifies, but the Vatican Archives yield no documentary evidence of this claim.

10 *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti* (Alcalá 1520)

11 Such a more elaborate edition was never published.

12 We learn of this admonition of Leo X to Zúñiga from a letter of Paolo Bombace, secretary to Cardinal Lorenzo Pucci, to Erasmus, in which he comments on the content of Erasmus' letter to him, which we no longer possess. See Epp 1213:37–41 and 1581:206–8.

13 Matt 23:5

14 Zúñiga's book, *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates*

parasites like Nomentanus and Balatro,[15] or to an even more humiliating fate. But what influenced them even more, I believe, was the peace of the church, which had already been rocked more than enough by the Lutheran schism; it made no sense to heap tragedy upon tragedy and, as the saying goes, add fuel to the fire.[16] Men who were very different from Zúñiga understood that since the fire emanating from that sect had not yet been quenched it could, if sulphur were added to it, easily be fanned into flame again; and they are not unaware how easily a recent evil makes a habit of coming to life again. For that to happen no more suitable pamphlet could emerge than this one by Zúñiga, which at the same time gives encouragement to the Lutherans (who were already, so it seemed, beginning to grow weak), attempts to drive me even against my will into their camp, and burdens the Pope and the clergy with malice, which should be attributed to the excerptor rather than the author. Indeed, the things I was saying here and there as the occasion demanded, with the aim of warning, not of criticizing (especially since what preceded or followed or was even mixed in served to soften the sharpness of the warning), not only gave no offence but were even read with pleasure.

This man put the extracts[17] on display once and for all in the most invidious way he could, omitting the material that softened their sharpness, and adding violent and even meaningless titles to exacerbate their effect. He did this principally from the first edition of the New Testament, although in the second and third editions I have moderated my tone in many places;[18] and not only in this work, but also in other ones, not because they appeared to be blasphemously written, but because it matters a great deal at what time one says or does something. I had written those words in times of peace, and when the reaction of most people to what constitutes true religion was a loud snore.[19] It seemed right to give them a wake-up call by means of timely

* * * * *

15 These are two parasites mentioned by Horace in *Satires* 2.8.25 and 64 respectively, who are reclining at the dinner table of the lavish host, Nasidienus Rufus. Nomentanus was given the role of identifying the exotic dishes while Balatro was the jester or buffoon. His name became synonymous with one talking nonsense.

16 *Adagia* I ii 9

17 Zúñiga's book consists of 61 excerpts from Erasmus' works, each preceded by a headnote or lemma indicating the subject at issue.

18 Henk Jan de Jonge points out that Erasmus is in error here, arguing in the introduction to his edition of the work that Zúñiga clearly used the second edition of the *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum.*

19 Ie before Luther's Reformation movement started to divide the church.

pieces of advice, whenever the occasion for advice occurred. Who foresaw that this age would arise, in which it is scarcely safe in certain quarters to speak of Paul or the Gospel?

How favourably, in this day and age, would anyone be received who quoted passages from the prophetic books, from the text of the Gospel, from the letters of the apostles, that lay down the pattern of conduct of a good pastor or bishop,[20] that pass severe censure on pastors who are slaves of their appetites and of money;[21] that describe the good priest and censure evil ones, that are spoken against false apostles,[22] false prophets,[23] and false Christians? If anyone were to excerpt from the writings of Cyprian, Jerome, or Bernard their attacks on the vices of bishops, clergy, monks, and nuns, and even the Roman See – which Bernard knew to be worldly, but, unless I am mistaken, rather less blatantly so than it is now; Jerome himself even called it Babylon and fled from it[24] – how large a book of blasphemies would be produced? How much ill will would it stir up against the leaders of the church, especially if it selected nothing but vitriolic passages, ignoring the balm; if it added to each of them malicious titles? He blasphemes like a heathen against the Roman pontiff, blasphemes against bishops like a pagan, rages against monks and nuns. Zúñiga on the other hand describes as 'blasphemy' anything that is said against morally corrupt behaviour, without anyone's name or status being censured, to the extent that he will not allow Spain to be mentioned, unless it is given its honorific religious title.[25] No wonder, then, if Zúñiga has fallen foul of sagacious leaders of the church,[26] who have made it clear to me in their writings what they think, not only from Rome, but also from Germany. As far as I am personally concerned, far from being harmed by this pamphlet of Zúñiga's, I am even encouraged by it.

Certain slanderers, as stupid as they are impudent, had spread the message that there were some detestable errors in my books; and in fact that

* * * * *

20 As in 1 Tim 3:1–7 and Titus 1:7–12
21 'For such people do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites,' Rom 16:18.
22 2 Cor 12:13
23 2 Peter 2:1
24 Jerome refers to Rome as Babylon in the preface to his translation of Didymus' *De Spiritu Sancto* PG 3 1031–2.
25 In his attack on Erasmus in 1520 Zúñiga had complained that Erasmus had not given Spain its due respect.
26 Principally, Popes Leo X and Adrian VI, and a number of cardinals. One could add to those the papal librarian, Girolamo Aleandro.

there was nothing in the works of the Lutherans that did not exist identically in mine. Although I could see nothing of the kind in what I had written, I did have a nagging fear that something was lying hidden somewhere that had escaped me, or that some kind of poison had been mixed in by my enemies. But this assiduity on Zúñiga's part both cheered me up and to a large extent freed me from ill will on the part of others. Since he is avowedly malicious; since he openly professes himself hostile; since it is clear from his first *Annotations*[27] how shamelessly he twists things that have been expressed even in the best possible way; since he boasts there is no work of mine that he has not pulled to pieces, no hiding place that he has not dug up to uncover any snakes lurking there;[28] to be sure, it is obvious to everyone from the facts themselves that the rumour that these people had spread is false, since there is nothing here, apart from the headings and the preface, that intelligent and honest people could not easily accept. I don't think that Zúñiga is so stupid as to imagine that the reader would be satisfied with the titles and preface alone.

Some learned people humorously assert that the book is falsely attributed,[29] and that it should be called an anthology; others make the mocking complaint that Martial's epigram[30] should have been placed at the head of the work: 'If you ask why headings are added I'll tell you; / so that, if you prefer, you may read the headings only.' For this reason I am not all that cross with my friend Zúñiga, at least on this score, especially since I understand from those who know him more closely, through meeting him and sharing his life, that he is not a complete sham. He frankly admits that nothing is sweeter to him than to 'murmur' (that is what he calls in his language to 'criticize'). He does not disguise the fact that he could no longer bear to see the name of Erasmus on display in every bookshop, while Zúñiga's name was nowhere. And he could see no quicker way of gaining a reputation than by slandering Lefèvre[31] and me. He admits that he has never suffered any injury at my hands, and that he did not undertake this task through any hatred of me, but

* * * * *

27 *Annotationes contra Erasmum*

28 In the preface to the *Blasphemiae* Zúñiga boasts of being the first to cast out impieties and blasphemies from Erasmus' works, as one who would speak of casting out serpents from their pit.

29 The Latin neologism is *pseudepigraphum.*

30 Martial 14.2.3–4

31 Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (*c* 1460–1536), was a French humanist, theologian, and translator of the Bible, CEBR 2 215–18. Zúñiga published *Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem* (Alcalá 1519).

partly through love of fame, as I have said, partly to please certain monks who were pushing him in this direction, and partly so that the chase that he's engaged in at Rome should have a more convenient outcome, since it's not flies that he's chasing,[32] by Jove, but a number of rich benefices for whose sake at Rome friend not uncommonly does away with friend by poison. And so no one is now more celebrated at Rome than Zúñiga. Everywhere people point him out: 'That's the scourge of Erasmus.'[33] The man himself frequently parades on horseback in the Campo de' Fiori and takes pleasure in the placards, takes pleasure in being pointed out. There the work is advertised in eighteen-inch-high letters: 'ZÚÑIGA versus ERASMUS.'[34] And a fair number of people read nothing apart from the placards. Nor can anything so unlearned be produced that it will not find someone to marvel at it, or be entertained with it. In the same piazza people are entertained by conjurors who swallow wine in their mouths and bring it out from their foreheads.[35] There the literary trifles that feeble pedants post up on Pasquillus are for sale.[36] So not only is he honest, in making clear what he regards as important, but also modest, since he's content with this kind of fame; I would certainly not be content with it.

Now hear in addition about Zúñiga's cunning. Either I am plainly deceived, or this is the task that some phylactery-bearers have been sweating over for more than three years now at Louvain and Cologne,[37] not without the waste of oil, to be sure, and also of wine.[38] While they were scrutinizing all those books of mine they often had no time for a pleasant drink.

Now see whether Zúñiga, who by his words has transferred to himself the glory achieved through the hard work of others, has any wit. What is

* * * * *

32 *Adagia* III ii 65

33 *'Ερασμομάστιξ*, an Erasmian coinage on the model of '*Ομηρομάστιξ*' (Homer whipper), the nickname of the critic Zoilus, c. 400–320 BC.

34 An allusion to the capitals in the title of *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates*

35 The prestidigitator would swallow the wine and then make it appear that he spat it out through his forehead.

36 Pasquillus, or in Italian Pasquino, is the remnant of a damaged copy of a Hellenistic statue discovered in 1501, situated in the Piazza di Sant'Egidio in Trastevere in Rome. It became the custom, which survives to this day, to post satiric epigrams on it in Latin, Italian or *romanesco*. Erasmus thus intimates that Zúñiga's attack is no better than these anonymous scribblings.

37 Erasmus is suggesting that Zúñiga got help from conservative Roman Catholics from the universities of Louvain/Leuven and Cologne.

38 *Adagia* I iv 24, 'I have wasted oil and toil,' referring to the scholar 'burning the midnight oil' and the athlete greasing himself in oil to no avail.

there here of Zúñiga apart from titles and a preface? It would not seem likely to me that Zúñiga, weighed down with so many languages, busying himself night and day in every branch of ancient literature, and on top of this exalting at Rome the varieties and the battles of fish,[39] and planning many other projects, would have so much free time as to have been able, or even to have wanted, to read through all those works of mine. The others[40] were trying to escape the ill will which was already affecting them quite badly; and the only thing their malice required was a vigorous and brazen-faced mountebank, whose appearance would serve as a mask, and who would play the old comedy from a wagon.[41] And so Zúñiga, led into this situation, has killed two birds, fame and fortune, with one stone.[42] In fact he ignores the ill will no less boldly than he shows contempt for the judgment of all scholars and right-minded people, either because there are few of them, as there always have been, or because it is not for them that this play is being performed. Nor do I intend for the present to respond to this patchwork of López, in case I should do him another favour, since I understand that he was surprised and delighted that I responded to his *Annotations*,[43] something that has caused me regret on more than one occasion; and I have highly commended the good sense of Lefèvre d'Étaples,[44] who has ignored the hired actor, together with his play. I will merely indicate the man's sense of humour with a few words taken from certain headings and from the preface.

Zúñiga, being expert in Hebrew, knew that 'blasphemies' are commonly understood to mean insults uttered against God. That meaning has come down to us from Hebrew, although the expression, which is used by Latin-speakers, is Greek, and in their language signifies nothing other than 'insult' in ours. And in fact here at the outset the author has hoodwinked

* * * * *

39 Zúñiga had lectured at the Sapienza in Rome on the Greek poet Oppian's *Halieutica*, a work on fishing, posing as an expert in the fish-market. Cf Ep 1260:191–4.

40 Those who assisted Zúñiga writing his *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates*

41 In Greek Old Comedy the god Dionysus was represented as arriving on a wagon, and his car was followed by other wagons from which magical creatures hurled indecencies at the crowd.

42 The saying does not exist in Greek and Latin writings, but it does exist in modern Dutch, 'Twee vliegen in een klap slaan' (to hit two flies in one blow).

43 See above, note 10; the response was the *Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione* of 1521 (LB IX 283–356; ASD IX-2; 1–160 above.

44 On him, see n31 above; he ignored Zúñiga's attack against him, *Annotationes contra Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem* 1519.

the reader, who should he believe the title, will imagine that the entire pamphlet is full of insults uttered against God, or against the saints, since Zúñiga, as I have indicated above, detects 'blasphemies' whenever human behaviour is severely criticized, in general and without harm coming to anyone; 'blasphemies' of this kind are to be found everywhere in the books of the prophets, the Gospels, the letters of the apostles, and of all orthodox writers. Is what Isaiah writes in chapter 56 not a grave blasphemy against pastors and bishops?[45] 'His watchmen are blind, they are all without knowledge; they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; dreaming, lying down, loving to slumber. The dogs have a mighty appetite; they never have enough. The shepherds also have no understanding; they have all turned to their own way, each to his own gain, one and all. "Come," they say, "let us get wine, let us fill ourselves with strong drink; and tomorrow will be like this day, great beyond measure."'[46] Why doesn't Zúñiga add at this point the title 'He blasphemes against bishops'? Why doesn't he add the same title to the section of the prophet Jeremiah, chapter 23, which consists entirely of a very free invective against wicked pastors?[47] These are the kinds of blasphemies that the Lord Jesus hurls at the Pharisees and scribes in the Gospel: 'Woe to you, hypocrites,[48] woe to you, blind, and fools!'[49] These are the kinds of blasphemies that Paul pours out with passion in so many passages against false apostles,[50] when he says that 'they serve their own appetites,'[51] not Jesus Christ, and that they deceive the hearts of the simple-minded by fair and flattering words,[52] when he issues a warning that the dogs and the mischief-makers should be avoided, when he calls them Antichrists.[53] How often does Tertullian,[54] and in imitation of him Cyprian,[55] lambaste with satirical wit the vices of virgins, married women, and monks, while the latter castigates the bishops of his time for ambition that goes as far as tyranny, and for greed

* * * * *

45 The chapter does not mention bishops.
46 Isa 56:10–12
47 Jer 23:1–4; 9–40
48 Matt 23:13 and passim
49 Matt 23:16–17
50 The word *pseudoapostolos* occurs only once in the New Testament, at 2 Cor 11:13.
51 Rom 16:18
52 Ibid.
53 Paul does not use this word, but it is found in 1 John 2:18.
54 Tertullian *De cultu feminarum* CCL 1.1 341–70
55 Cyprian *De habitu virginum* PL 4 456–7

that extends to usury.[56] In how many places, and with what freedom, does Jerome do the same? And yet at that time more consideration should have been shown towards those who held the title of Christians, because they still had a bad name among the pagans. Nowadays there is virtually nothing that stands in the way of the Christian faith, except our behaviour. If anyone were to collect examples from the books of ancient or even recent authors, how many Iliads[57] of blasphemies would be produced, seeing that more blasphemies could be collected from a single work of St Bernard, to which he gave the title *On Consideration*,[58] than from all my compositions. And yet anyone who reads my works will see how unwillingly I did so, how constrained I was by the actual subject-matter, how gentle and circumspect I was, how many things I left unsaid; I would willingly have said nothing at all, if by remaining silent it had been possible to 'improve' the situation. But since Zúñiga had made up his mind to pursue this course I wonder why it did not occur to him at this point to copy out the whole of the *Praise of Folly*, a book that was designed for no other purpose than to castigate people's lives. Thus the light-hearted trifler has tried straightaway with his very title to mislead the reader. Clearly Erasmus has uttered blasphemies, but in the sense that we read in the Gospel of 'blasphemy against the Spirit';[59] not spoken by him against others, but spoken by wicked men against him. They are blasphemies of Erasmus, but made by Diego López.

Again, what he calls 'impieties' are not things maliciously spoken or done against God or the saints, but warnings, in my opinion, about the superstitious veneration of saints, about devotion that is misplaced or focused on things that are inappropriate. It is called 'impiety' when it teaches true piety and exposes what is false. An example is Paul's impiety when he pours scorn on those who taught Judaism in the place of Christ: 'Do not handle, do not taste, do not touch.'[60] Again, when he says, 'while physical training is of some value, godliness is valuable in every way.'[61] Such is the impiety of Isaiah, when he rejects and turns away from the festivals, victims, and fasts

* * * * *

56 Cyprian *Sententiae Episcoporum 87 de haereticis baptizandis* CSEL 3.1 436
57 *Adagia* I iii 26 (*Ilias malorum*)
58 Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione* PL 182 727–808
59 Matt 12:31. Thus the words in Zúñiga's title, *Erasmi blasphemiae,* should mean 'blasphemies against Erasmus, interpreting 'Erasmi' as an objective, not a subjective genitive.
60 Col 2:21. In the Vulgate the three verbs are in the second person plural.
61 1 Tim 4:8

of the Jews, because they believed that they found favour with God through these things, when otherwise they abounded in wrongdoing.[62]

But what he adds to recommend the pamphlet is even more amusing: these 'Blasphemies and impieties, now for the first time made public by him, and elsewhere in a separate volume refuted.'[63] More than twenty thousand copies of the *Praise of Folly* have been printed,[64] and there is not one work of mine from which Zúñiga collects his blasphemies and impieties that has not been published in several thousand copies; and does he boast that these things have been made public for the first time by him? Does what has been printed so often and is thumbed by everyone not yet appear to have been made public? And did it need an obscure pamphlet by Zúñiga to make these things known to the world?

But I long to know on what basis he rebuts those charges that are directed not against any particular person but in general, whether against wicked monks or corrupt bishops or rulers or evil-living priests. Is he going to tell us that no such people exist? If only our times were so blessed that that might really be the case, and that he could show Erasmus to be more untrustworthy than any Cretan.[65] He must defend either all of them or none, since I have not criticized any individual by name. Or will he turn my attacks back on myself? I have not boasted of my merits anywhere. And he is an unhappy advocate if he cannot protect the honour of others except by speaking ill of me, which a pimp could do just as well.

Now I am going to adduce a number of Zúñiga's impudent titles, which he has placed as specific headings to certain passages, not content with the overall titles. If at any time I give advice to monks, as to what those who aspire to true piety should avoid, or the things that constitute true religion, he has prefixed the title 'Against Monks,' 'Against Religious,' though the

* * * * *

62 Isa 1:10–14 on criticism on festivals and victims, and Isa 58:3–6 on criticism on fasting practice

63 The word 'elsewhere' refers to the original manuscript version of Zúñiga's work, now in Naples, which he was never allowed to publish.

64 This estimate is very modest. Beatus Rhenanus, who supervised the printing of many of Erasmus' works for Johann Froben in Basel, mentions in a letter to Erasmus of 17 April 1515 that 1800 copies of the first edition of the *Praise of Folly* had been printed (Ep 328:46). By 1522, when this apology was written, 24 editions had appeared, so that it is possible that twice that number of copies had been printed

65 The Cretans were considered to be liars, cf *Adagia* I ii 29, 'To play Cretan with a Cretan.' Paul also states, 'Cretans are always liars,' Titus 1:12.

topic is intended above all *for the benefit* of monks both good and bad: for the benefit of the good, so that they may heed the advice and become better; for the benefit of the bad, so that they may be converted to a better way of life.

Again, when I take the opportunity offered by the gospel text[66] and loathing war as I do, exhort Christians to peace, above all the clergy, who, though they claim to preach the gospel of peace, sound the trumpet for war in their sermons to the people, and make Christ the author of this madness of ours which now lands us in endless conflict – this is the extent to which they distort his message and even wage war themselves – what could be more honest or more necessary than such advice, since it harms no one? Yet he has prefaced it with the title 'He calls Christ's priests Pharisees.' In fact I call such priests a 'kind of Pharisees,' that is, similar to the Pharisees: Christ's priests are very unlike them. In that passage, as a matter of fact, by 'clergy' I was referring to certain bishops, but above all to Julius.[67] By a 'kind of Pharisees' I was referring to certain monks who at that time, in both France and Britain, were agitating for war in their sermons with astonishing shamelessness. But if anyone who does not approve of everything that popes do is guilty of impiety, there were also many other things in Julius that I did not approve of, not only I, however, but people of the best sort. Making use of the passage in chapter 5 of Acts[68] I contrast the triumphs that I witnessed Julius II celebrating, first at Bologna and later at Rome,[69] with the power of the apostles, who converted the world through their heavenly teaching, whose miracles were so abundant that the sick were healed simply by their shadow;[70] and I place this display of apostolic power above those triumphs. However, I write nothing derogatory about the latter, although – to speak candidly – I watched them at the time not without a silent groan. Here Zúñiga has added the title 'He mocks the triumphs of the church.' Brazen-faced impudence, is it mockery to prefer those genuine apostolic gifts? And what, after all, does our friend Zúñiga call 'the triumphs of the church'? Those that would fill

* * * * *

66 John 20:21, 'Jesus said to them again, "Peace be with you."' In Erasmus' annotation to this passage he refers to priests who call people to war as 'this race of Pharisees,' ASD VI-6 164:51.

67 Pope Julius II (pope 1503–13), whose bellicosity Erasmus satirized in the anonymous pamphlet *Iulius exclusus e caelis* (1514, printed 1517), written by Erasmus

68 *Annot in Act* 5:14 ASD VI-6 222:73–9

69 It seems clear from this statement that Erasmus was present at both triumphal entries, in Bologna and in Rome.

70 Acts 5:15

even a worldly potentate with shame? Paul, an outstanding warrior, has very different ones in view.

Again, in Acts chapter 9,[71] where Peter is described as lodging with a tanner named Simon, I comment: 'O how great a guest; and the pre-eminent Prince of the apostles lodges with a host of any rank! Nowadays the palaces of three kings would scarcely suffice to receive the vicar of Peter. To such an extent has the wealth of the church increased.' Here he has added the title, 'He attacks the wealth of the church, and calls the pope "vicar of Peter.'" I beg you, reader, see the man's extraordinary impudence. Where in this context does any word of 'attacking' occur? Although in fact Jerome did on one occasion deplore the fact that the church was increasing in wealth, but declining in moral strength.[72] I will say nothing at this point about what people of true religious faith feel about the turmoil created by certain popes. Either I am mistaken, or the one who is now pope[73] will not tolerate every sort of ostentation; however, as if I had a premonition that someone like Zúñiga would emerge, I had added in the second edition: 'One shall rejoice at success, if in fact this is truly the basis of the church's success, and if success is matched by elevation.'[74] But it is intolerable that I should have called the pope 'vicar of Peter.' Is a vicar not one who has succeeded in the place and situation of another? But in how many places do I call the same pope 'vicar of Christ'? Could anyone interpret this as if I were denying that the pope is the 'vicar of Christ'? But there was a reason why he should be called 'vicar of Peter' in that context, because it had been preceded by a mention of Peter with whom I was comparing our popes, his successors. A dreadful blasphemy, if, having called Peter the prince of the order of apostles, I call the pope his vicar, that is, his successor. Zúñiga, it appears, will insist that he be called 'companion of Christ.' He misunderstands the religious feeling of the Roman pontiffs if he believes that they are so puffed up as to wish to appear as the successors of Christ in the same way as one man succeeds another who hands over a province. Or is it not sufficiently splendid to succeed Peter, the prince of the apostles? For although the bishop of Rome is rightly said to be in some sense the 'vicar of Christ,' yet if he is placed in comparison with Christ's dignity, what is he other than a wretched worm, however much he excels in authority when compared with us?

* * * * *

71 Acts 9:43
72 Jerome *Vita Malchi* 1 PL 23 55–9
73 Adrian VI, pope 1522–3, the only Dutchman to hold this office
74 *Annot in Act* 9:43

Matthew, chapter 16.[75] I indicate what Origen thought about the passage that we accommodate in order to prove the primacy of the Roman pontiff.[76] That opinion does not seem altogether to support those who set virtually no limits to the pope's supremacy. Augustine's view is clearly opposed.[77] But in the same place I indicate the contrary opinion of Cyprian,[78] who wrote that the church had been founded upon Peter, though Augustine explicitly rejects that view. Anyone who does this is not prejudicial towards either party, but demonstrates to the reader that the passage should be weighed. I also occasionally do the same in the notes where we have commented on Jerome:[79] that he is inconsistent, and does not seem to hold the same views everywhere about the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, whereas if I had noted only those passages that tell against the Pope's supremacy I might have seemed to regard him unfavourably. As it is, when I indicate the contrary passages as well, I have made it clear that I make no final judgment, but have simply demonstrated that the passages should be weighed. In fact, I add this comment on the letter to Damasus: 'Here Jerome seems to make all the churches subordinate to the bishop of Rome.'[80] So what else am I doing than indicating here and there the passages that anyone who decides to write on this subject might rebut or approve? What then is meant by Zúñiga's title, 'Reeks of Lutheran impiety'? Rather, Zúñiga's language reeks of scurrilous impudence. In these very words of mine, that Zúñiga alleges to discredit me, I admit that these words of Christ are applicable above all to the Roman pontiff and I call him the leader of the Christian faith. What could be more opposed to Luther's assertions? Finally, in so many of my letters and prefaces I give so much honour to the bishop of Rome that some people criticize me for flattery.[81]

* * * * *

75 Matt 16:18 and Erasmus' *Annot* ASD VI-5 246–8
76 Origen *Comm in Matt* 12:10 GCS 10:84–6
77 Augustine *Sermon* 76.1–2 PL 38 479–80
78 Cyprian *Ep* 59.7.3 CCSL 3C 348
79 In his scholia to Jerome's *Ep* 15 (to Damasus), *Opera omnia* (Froben: Basel 1516) Vol 2:132
80 See previous note.
81 A good example of this is the dedicatory letter of his *Novum Testamentum* to Pope Leo X, which opens with these words: 'To Leo the Tenth, Pontiff supreme in every way, from Erasmus of Rotterdam, least of theologians.' Ep 384 CWE 3 221:1–3.

Acts chapter 23. This was the note I had written: 'May God strike you, you whitewashed wall!'[82] St Jerome, adducing this passage in his dialogues against Pelagius,[83] does indeed excuse Paul, but he admits that he did not show the meekness that Christ showed. But Jerome wrote this while buttressing his case from every angle and while searching for some trace of imperfect sanctity even in Christ himself. Here, if we believe Zúñiga's title, I charge Jerome with blasphemy, just as if I had said that Jerome was attributing sin to Christ. In that passage Jerome is arguing with such great vehemence against the one who maintained that the human race could live without sin that he does not allow the prophets, or the apostles, or any mortal creature total freedom from sin. And in fact, carried away to this point by the heat of the discussion, he quotes these words from the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*,[84] which many people attribute to Matthew: 'See, the mother of the Lord and his brothers were saying to him: "John the Baptist baptizes for the forgiveness of sins. Let us go to be baptized by him." But he said to them: "What sin have I committed, that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless by chance this very thing that I have spoken is ignorance."'[85] Why does Jerome consider these words, except to show for the sake of argument that the mother of the Lord, who wanted to be baptized for the forgiveness of sins, was not free from sin, and that she seemed with these words to impute also to her son something that could be washed away by baptism. Nor does the Lord absolutely repel that suspicion from himself replying: 'unless by chance this very thing that I have spoken is ignorance.' The Hebrews sometimes call a slight fault, committed through error rather than evil intentions, ignorance. Zúñiga will say that an apocryphal gospel has no weight, nor does it with me, even though Jerome adds that it is thought by most people to be by Matthew, as if unwilling for it to be held in complete contempt.

Jerome did not consider that this was any sign of fallibility in Christ, however slight. He would of course have been guilty of sin if he had felt this. Nor do I fix this charge on Jerome. I have a far higher opinion of him – but

* * * * *

82 *Annot in Act* 23:3 ASD VI-6 318:191–5

83 Jerome *Dialogus adversus Pelagium* 3.4 PL 23 600C

84 This is an apocryphal gospel written in Aramaic which is no longer extant. It derived its name from the Nazarene community of Palestine during the Roman period. All that remains to us are notations and commentaries from various church fathers, including Jerome, who claims to have translated it into Greek. It has many affinities with the gospel of Matthew. Jerome himself considered it to be the original Gospel of Matthew in Aramaic, PL 23 643B–C

85 Jerome *Dialogus adversus Pelagium* 3.2 PL 23 597B–598A

when debating he frequently tries out ideas that are unreasonable in order to make those that are reasonable convincing, and he attempts to ensnare his opponent in every kind of trap so that when the latter, already defeated, has surrendered, he may be taught a lesson in the things that really matter. I said this without doubt while searching by means of argument. Anyone who looks for evidence even in the apocrypha is of course engaged in our search. Nor does the text read 'imperfect sanctity,' but '*a certain trace of* imperfect sanctity.'[86] If a thing to which something can be added is imperfect, there is also that regular topic of debate in the schools, whether so great a degree of grace existed in Christ that no greater degree could be given to a creature.[87] In addition, 'trace' indicates a certain form. The word 'certain' adds intensity. Undoubtedly Christ is said to have been indignant and to have spoken with anger. This could at least have seemed a 'trace of imperfect sanctity,' since he himself forbade anger completely. He certainly had this in common with us, that he could be angry, but not that he could be wrongly angry. He also frequently carries the weakness of his body in himself. This could also be said to be a 'trace of imperfect sanctity.' There is the issue, reader, and you can see, unless I am mistaken, how far I am from charging Jerome with blasphemy. If there is any blasphemy here, it belongs entirely to Zúñiga.

In the Epistle to the Romans, chapter 9,[88] on the text 'Who is in all things God, blessed,' I had commented: 'Unless this clause has been added,[89] just as we have come upon some that have been added, this is a specific passage in which Paul plainly declares Christ to be God.'[90] Now listen to Zúñiga's title: 'An obstinate and completely false doubt and assertion.' In the first place, how can the same thing be a doubt and an assertion?

* * * * *

86 *Annot in Act* 23:3 ASD VI-6 319:194–5

87 This sentence *per se* is not found in Peter of Lombard's *Sententiae* nor in Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, especially part two of book two (*Secunda secundae*), both of which texts were often discussed in the schools, but it has a scholastic ring.

88 Rom 9:5

89 By this clause he means the phrase 'who is above all God blessed forever,' which has been much disputed. Most of the fathers of the church, Erasmus states in his Annotation, believed that the phrase referred to the preceding word, Christ ('From whom is Christ according to the flesh – Christ who is [or was] above all'), and this interpretation is followed in the Authorized and the Catholic versions. Others construed it differently: 'from whom is Christ according to the flesh, which Christ, since he is God above all, is [or be] blessed forever,' or 'from whom is Christ according to the flesh. God who is above all be blessed forever.' For an excellent and extensive discussion of this passage, see CWE 56 242–52.

90 *Annot in Rom* 9:5 CWE 56 242–52

Then, who has ever said that doubt is false? In fact, one who doubts makes no statement, much less an assertion. Or is it a falsehood that I say that some passages have been added? That is incontrovertibly the case at the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer,[91] to say nothing of other places. However, with reference to this passage, I thus gently put forward a doubt, not my own, but one that could occur to anybody, in order immediately to refute it, adding (a fact cleverly concealed by Zúñiga), 'and the Greek copies, at least those I have seen, agree.'[92] Next I bring forward orthodox writers[93] who earnestly adduce this passage against the Arians.[94] This is surely to remove doubt. Yet I also found this clause omitted in Cyprian,[95] something that I make clear I attribute to scribal error.

From the same epistle, chapter 14,[96] I criticize the superstition of Christians of the common sort who regard the choice of foods as the most important aspect of religion, and hence condemn their neighbour as being an inadequate Christian, while we ignore those things without which no one can be a true Christian. Who nowadays, for instance, recoils from adulterers, money-grubbers, slanderers, the revengeful, the violent, wicked men who wage war? Who on the other hand does not regard with horror anyone who eats meat on Friday? I did not condemn the choice of foods, which the church has prescribed with good reason, but I do condemn the perverse judgment of the common people. Therefore, the title that Zúñiga has attached to this chapter, 'He attacks the choice of foods,' is false.

In the second epistle to the Corinthians, under the heading on these words: 'Another Christ,'[97] I warn that we should be careful, so that we ourselves should not also be led astray from the sincerity of Christ towards the things of this world and towards Jewish superstitions, and look for another

* * * * *

91 This doxology, 'For thine is the kingdom, etc,' is rejected by the Catholic church but exists in Protestant and Byzantine versions. The argument for its rejection is that it does not appear in the two earliest witnesses, the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, but it does exist in the Codex Washingtonensis and in the majority of Byzantine manuscripts.

92 Ibidem

93 That is, Theophylact (whom Erasmus called Vulgarius) *Comm in Rom* 9:5 PG 124 461A–B and Origen *Comm in Rom* VII 13 PG 14 1140C

94 Arians believed that Jesus was begotten by God at a point in time and was subordinate to the Father. Arianism began in the fourth century.

95 De Jonge points out, however, that it does exist in Cyprian's *Adversus Iudaeos* 2.6.

96 *Annot in Rom* 14:1 ASD VI-7 322:143–7

97 *Annot in 2 Cor* 11:4 ASD VI-8 446:12–16

Christ, when the true Christ was wholly innocent of everything of that kind. I do not say that this has happened, but that we should be careful that it does not happen; and I do not make an unqualified criticism of riches, but I would not wish Christ to be burdened by them, as if he taught us to pursue riches and as if the church is most successful when it is wealthy. Moreover, if Zúñiga is satisfied with Jewish rituals, let him enjoy them as far as I am concerned.[98] I never approved of them nor will I ever do so. And Zúñiga had given this section the title 'He blasphemes.' Who indeed could tolerate this blasphemy, where I urge Christians to pursue to the best of their ability the purity of Christ's teaching? Surely anyone who taught such notions in a sermon would be worthy of being publicly stoned. How will Zúñiga refute this blasphemy? He will urge us 'to invoke,' in place of the true Christ, 'another Christ, weighed down with riches, weighed down with power, dominion, pleasure, and all the trappings of this world, and also steeped in more than Jewish rituals.'[99]

Epistle to the Colossians, chapter 1.[100] Taking my cue from Paul, when he calls the word of God a 'mystery,' I warn that in that passage 'sacrament' means 'secret,' not 'a sacrament' such as the seven that are listed by the church, and I express scorn for the ignorance of those who, knowing no Greek, think that wherever they find the term 'sacrament,' reference is being made to the seven sacraments of the church, or something similar. Here Zúñiga adds the title: 'He mocks the number of the seven Sacraments.' What more than meretricious effrontery! In fact, I everywhere confirm the canon of seven Sacraments; I would sooner add two than remove one. But I laugh at the ignorance of certain people who think that it is a sufficiently convincing argument for the support of a Sacrament of the church if a commentator translates 'mystery' as 'sacrament.'

In the first epistle to Timothy, chapter 3,[101] taking my cue from the passage I draw attention to the fact that nowadays nothing else is required of priests, deacons, and sub-deacons except celibacy, while Paul lists many other gifts. We refuse the priesthood to those who have been married twice, while we admit murderers and people guilty of even more heinous crimes. Then I write that it would be helpful, with regard to the conditions of these times, if the leaders of the church were to allow priests who lack self-control

* * * * *

98 Erasmus had already insinuated more than once that Zúñiga was Jewish.
99 A slight variation of the passage referred to in n97
100 Col 1:25–6 and *Annot* ASD VI-9 348:216–20
101 1 Tim 3:2 and *Annot* ASD VI-10 58–60:535–54

to marry. Zúñiga has given this passage the title: 'He condemns clerical celibacy.' What could be more absurd than this heading? Rather, I condemn those in the celibate state who disgracefully and openly indulge their lust, and I consider that they should either not be admitted to the priesthood or should be helped by being allowed to marry.

In the epistle to Titus, chapter 1,[102] I give the warning that popes and bishops, and other rulers, cannot rightly prescribe what is best unless they themselves are free from those passions that disturb the mind's judgment. I also complain, speaking in general terms, that nowadays scarcely anyone is more prone to desires of this kind than rulers, ecclesiastical no less than secular; and that as a consequence neither imperial nor papal decrees, neither universities nor the proclamations of the church, are wholly without blemish. At this point Zúñiga, tearing his garments (I suppose) exclaims in his title 'He blasphemes!' I desire to be refuted. So what should I say? That there is nothing in imperial edicts, nothing in papal constitutions, that is not pure and blameless, that no decisions are reached in the schools with a view to flattery, that nothing is spoken in sermons with regard to human passions? That there have been no popes subject to human passions? That there are no secular rulers who are swayed by ambition, anger, or greed? Who would tolerate the obvious flattery? If rulers are not affected by passions, whence do so many wars arise among the current upheavals, not without enormous destruction of human life? Let me speak for a moment about matters that are known to everyone. I am not delivering a judgment on any specific individual. Wherever we have war like this, the evil originates from corrupted passions. But to criticize imperial laws is dangerous. If only there were nothing in them that could be justly criticized! Yet if there is nothing, why does papal law in places cancel imperial law? However, I did not hold this opinion, which Zúñiga interprets as meaning that papal laws are evil, but that good laws are corrupted to accommodate our desires. I held the same opinion about imperial laws. For what decree of the ancients is there that we do not distort for the sake of ambition and greed? And yet if I had said that some papal laws reflect human desires rather than the pure essence of Christ, what would have been the offence in that? Not all laws are enacted by synods. Some are simply rescripts, some are specific to the city of Rome. Finally, some of the others are also cancelled according to circumstance. In the schools too, how often have I myself seen people at the Sorbonne[103] laughing when in

* * * * *

102 Titus 1:8 and *Annot* ASD VI-10 184:138–44
103 Erasmus studied there (1495–9).

debate they held different opinions from those they were expressing. During sermons I have frequently heard things that Gnatho would be ashamed to say to Thraso.[104] But if rulers are in thrall to human passions, and laws, canonical decrees, and sacred Scripture are twisted to suit their depraved desires, will not the purity of gospel teaching be at an end? Are we not now close to seeing what I was then prophesying?

In the preface, addressed to Abbot Volz,[105] that I later added to the *Enchiridion,* I lamented that 'the mass of Christians had been corrupted, not only in their affections but also in their ideas,' and further that 'those who professed to be pastors and teachers,' and who had the capacity to leaven by their wit the foolishness of the people, 'were for the most part taking advantage of their position as Christ's representatives for their own profit.'[106] I make it clear that I do not venture to say anything about the world's supreme monarchs, in the face of whose obvious vices it is scarcely permitted to let fall a sigh. Since these things are often absolutely true, how could I explain the matter more circumspectly? How could I take greater care not to harm anyone? There are so many pastors, so many rulers in the world, so who could be offended, seeing that I do not attack all of them, but only some? And that I do so in general, not specifying the French or the Spanish or the Italians?

Again, when he cites a passage from the *Enchiridion*, he has added the title: 'On Monasticism, which he calls Judaism,' so that the reader who is satisfied simply with the title may be led to believe that I totally condemn all monks. But listen now to what follows: 'I did so with all the more alacrity because I was somewhat afraid you might fall into the hands of that superstitious fraternity among the religious, who, partly pursuing their own personal interests, and partly out of great zeal but not according to knowledge scour land and sea,[107] and, whenever they find anyone abandoning wicked courses and returning to a saner and better life, immediately attempt to thrust him into a monastic order by means of the most impudent urging and threats and cajoleries, as if Christianity did not exist outside the monk's cowl;

* * * * *

104 Two characters in Terence's *Eunuchus*, a parasite and a braggart respectively. Erasmus knew Terence's plays by heart.

105 Paul Volz (1480–1544) was the abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Honcourt (Hügshofen) near Sélestat (Schlettstadt). The friendship between Erasmus and Volz went back at least to 1515. He converted to the reformers before 1521 but this did not interfere with their friendship.

106 CWE 6 76:167–73, freely cited

107 Erasmus here alludes to Matt 23:15: 'Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you cross sea and land to make a single convert.'

and then, after filling his mind with mere quibbles and thorny problems that nobody could solve, they bind him to some petty observances, of human, not divine, origin, and plunge the poor fellow into a kind of Judaism, teaching him how to tremble, not how to love.'[108] Thus far Zúñiga quotes my words. First, I criticize certain monks who for their own interests or for superstitious reasons entice naive young men into the monastic life, and having enticed them, do not teach them true religion, but rather a kind of Judaism. Which does Zúñiga here want us to believe, that all monks are like this, or none? If he thinks they are all like this, let them all be gone. But I am speaking not about all, but about some who are depraved and superstitious. And my intention here was not to criticize any individual, but to come to the help of naive young men who time and time again are ensnared by these people. But if Zúñiga claims that such people do not exist, witnesses can be found everywhere who can show that he is wrong: the whole world is full of complaints of this kind. In fact, the warning that I give there is one that monks ought to give in their sermons, if they were as honest as they would like to be thought. Certainly, those who are true monks give the same warning as I do.

From the *Methodus*,[109] where I note that the words 'You are Peter'[110] etc, apply to the whole body of the Christian people; and again when he says 'Feed my sheep,'[111] that 'Peter' indicates the figure of any bishop, Zúñiga has added the title: 'Smacks of Lutheran and Wycliffite impiety.' And yet, at that time Luther had written nothing,[112] nor have I ever touched on any Wycliffite doctrine.[113] And no precise ruling had yet been made about these matters,[114] at all events even orthodox writers vary in their treatment of these passages. Nevertheless, I do not deny that that passage does not apply to the Roman pontiff. Does not that profession of faith apply to the entire body of the church? Is not that profession the basis of our religion? Is not the bishop of

* * * * *

108 CWE 66 126–7
109 *Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam*; CWE 41 525–6
110 Matt 16:18
111 John 21:15–16
112 In fact, the German reformer Martin Luther (1483–1546) had published many pamphlets and books – in German and in Latin – between 1517 and 1519, the year of publication of the *Ratio*.
113 The English theologian and reformer John Wycliffe (c 1330–1384) denied the foundation of the Pope's authority in Scripture. He is considered a forerunner of the Reformation.
114 The issue of the papacy was discussed at the Disputation of Leipzig in July 1519.

Rome therefore the supreme teacher of the faith, because it is the faith of the whole church? Does he not therefore possess the supreme power of the keys, because the consensus of the whole church has the same power? Finally, is it the responsibility of the Roman pontiff alone, that he is commanded three times to love Christ and so to feed his flock? Does it not therefore apply to the other bishops, because it applies above all to the bishop of Rome? However, I wrote these words before this tragic conflict over the primacy of the pope – in which I have never meddled – had arisen, and I wrote them not without making use of orthodox authorities. I indicate how the passage is interpreted by Augustine, by Origen, by Chrysostom, the opinions of Jerome, Cyprian, Bede;[115] and yet I make no assertion of my own, but simply put forward in that place views intended for the sake of example, as I do in many other places; I repeatedly state that fact at that point. And this passage that Zúñiga criticizes has been altered in the later editions; not because it contained heresy, but because this present age suffers from a great perversity of fault-finding.

Again, in bringing under review a certain passage from the same work,[116] he has added the title, 'He Lutheranizes.' In the first place, what could be more impudent than to say of me, 'He Lutheranizes,' since I wrote all those things before I had heard of Luther? Whether he 'Erasmianizes' anywhere, I do not know: certainly I cannot 'Lutheranize.' But let us take a look, I pray, at this 'Lutheranism.' I give a warning that certain monks, and theologians who compile trifling Summas, ensnare the consciences of naive or superstitious people in the meshes of their opinions about matters such as vows, tithes, satisfactions, dispensations, and confessions, and that they do so to increase their own tyrannical power and profit; and that on this subject we hear every day the complaints of devout people who have at heart the welfare of the Christian flock.[117] What, I ask, is 'Lutheran' about that? I criticize evil people who for their own advantage ensnare and disturb the consciences of the populace. If there exists everywhere an exceedingly large number of such people, what crime is there in having warned about something that is known to virtually everyone, and that no good person does

* * * * *

115 Quoted in *Annot in Matt* 16:18: Augustine, *Sermo* 76 PL 38 479–80; Origen, *Comm in Matthaeum* 12.10; Chrysostom is only quoted in the fourth edition of the *Novum Testamentum*, but only indirectly through a quotation from the *Catena aurea* of Thomas Aquinas on Matt 16:18; Jerome is not mentioned until the fourth edition; Cyprian *Ep* 59.7.3; not Bede, but Ps Beda *In Matt expositio* PL 92 78–9.

116 The *Ratio vera theologiae*

117 *Ratio verae theologiae* CWE 41 542 and 546

not lament? Luther, according to report, abolishes all vows, abolishes confession.[118] In this passage I condemn nothing except quibbles introduced by Pharisees for the purpose of ensnaring consciences.

Now see how different from the Lutherans is the tone of the passage that follows. 'It is not,' I say, 'for me or for people like me to tear down what has been accepted through common use. Still, it is right to desire that that Divine Spirit should breathe into the minds of popes and princes in order that they wish to examine those things is such a way that more true godliness and less superstition attend to the people, and that less tyranny also is allowed to those whose good fortune is fed by the evils the public endures.'[119] I ask you, reader: do such respectful, such salutary warnings smack of Lutheran heresy? If I wished to mention each of the sorts of things that are planned by those people, and the arts they use to make a mockery of the minds of simple folk, then you would understand that I have not written these things without good reason. If Luther had written everything in this way no one would have condemned his books, criticizing in a moderate tone the abuse of people and not the decrees of the church, to gain the favour of certain disgraceful characters whose impudence or rather impiety were already beginning to become intolerable to the world. I certainly consider that this upheaval has for the most part been welcomed by them. But listen to the conclusion of this impious chapter: 'Although I would wish,' I say, 'that these things had been brought into the open, at least after the manner of an example, since at present it is my intention to instruct, not to cause strife.'[120] What impiety! Yet Zúñiga, the most pious of exegetes, adds great impiety to these matters.

In the letter to Dorp,[121] urging at an opportune moment that no one is so cautious in writing that he is not occasionally seized by literary ardour, I write these words: 'Jerome himself, pious and serious as he was, does not restrain himself at various times from quite fierce outbursts of indignation against

* * * * *

118 Luther had published his *De votis monasticis* in 1521, in which he argued that monks and nuns did not sin in violating their vows since they were invalid anyway. As to private or auricular confession, he never argued for their abolition.

119 CWE 41 546

120 CWE 41 546

121 Maarten van Dorp (1485–1525) was a professor of theology at the University of Louvain who engaged in a friendly exchange of letters with Erasmus about the *Praise of Folly.* Erasmus' lengthy letter of defence, Ep 337 appeared together with all the early editions of the work from 1516 onwards, Ep 337, CWE 3 113:54–7.

Vigilantius,[122] from levelling rather excessive insults against Jovinian,[123] and from employing somewhat bitter invective against Rufinus.'[124] You have the evidence; now listen to Zúñiga's title: 'An insult to St Jerome.' It is not surprising if this seems insulting to Zúñiga, since he has charged me with blasphemy in the *Annotations*[125] because I said that Jerome, despite being devout, and eloquent, was still a man. We find error in the apostles, and some measure of human passions, and is it an insult to attribute something of the kind to Jerome? I know that Jerome, now in heaven, is not guilty of any sin, but he himself would not deny that while he was still carrying around this wretched mortal body he was prone to many human failings. Why does Augustine deplore at such length the bitter quarrel that had arisen between Rufinus and Jerome?[126] Why does he complain that he is being subjected by his boxing-gloves? And yet I diminish this very aspect by the use of comparative expressions '*quite* fierce, *rather* excessive, *somewhat* bitter.'[127]

There remains one further 'blasphemy.' Folly, having had many things to say not 'about devotion to individual saints,' as Zúñiga asserts, but about the superstitious and ridiculous worship of the saints (about which no one has ever said enough), finally, worn out, concludes her speech by saying that she cannot pursue each individual case, since 'the entire way of life of all Christians abounds on every side with absurdities of that kind, but that priests have no trouble in both tolerating and fostering them, knowing pretty well how much profit tends to accrue from them.'[128] If this is absolutely true, as it is, it's a healthy warning, not blasphemy. 'But,' he says, 'you condemn the entire way of life of all Christians.' Rather, when I mention Christians I have in mind not individual human beings, but specific individual classes and national groups: that explains why I add 'way of life.' I am criticizing the behaviour of the common people. Perhaps superstitions of this kind do

* * * * *

122 Vigilantius, a theologian from Gaul, contended with Jerome on the cult of relics, which he considered to be idolatry; Jerome's invective was *Contra Vigilantium* (406 BC) PL 23 353–68.

123 Jovinian was a monk who was a critic of celibacy and asceticism, to whom in 393 AD Jerome addressed his *Adversus Jovinianum* PL 23 221–352.

124 Rufinus was a monk of Aquileia who became involved in a celebrated controversy with Jerome chiefly over the doctrines of Origen. For this passage of Ep 337 see CWE 3 313:54–7.

125 *Annot in Act* 23:3 ASD V-6 318:191–5

126 Augustine, *Ep* 73.6–10 to Jerome

127 Ep 337:56–7

128 *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 115

not exist among the Spanish. But among us, and in the regions where I have lived, popular superstition runs wild to the point of insanity, so much so that magistrates and bishops have often tried in vain to put an end to it. But the foolishness of the people is fed by certain priests, who are more concerned with profit than with devotion and the worship of God. Let stones be cast at Folly, who has spewed out this 'blasphemy.'

But there is an even more damning charge: that the same figure takes monks to task with many witticisms; not all, but some who are either wicked or superstitious, who are nothing less than what they are said to be.[129] They take their name from solitude,[130] while some of them are so involved in worldly affairs that nobody is more prominent in market-places, public assemblies, military quarters, on journeys, on board ship, in carriages;[131] who consider that the summit of holiness is to have had no contact with literature, so much so that sometimes they do not even know how to read.[132] Then there are those who, while they are not restrained by any zeal for true devotion, nevertheless consider that God is immensely indebted to them, because they give voice to the psalms, repeated by rote, to be sure, but not understood, in a harsh and stentorian bellow, a great nuisance to themselves and of no benefit to anyone.[133] Perhaps in Spain all monks sing the psalms with angelic voices; where we are it is almost traditional, especially among the Franciscans and Carmelites, to project their voices from their chests with amazing force, as if they were competing to display the power of their lungs; one would say that they sounded more like bulls than men. Certainly, every choir as a rule includes someone with a huge voice, which he blasts out from his chest in an unnatural way so that he can produce no sound other than the ass's 'O'[134] and ensures that neither he himself nor anyone from the whole choir can be understood when he is singing.

In addition, Folly laughs at those sorts of people who take such pride in their appearance, the colour of their clothing, names and titles, the choice of foods, and other human ordinances, that they consider themselves to

* * * * *

129 CWE 27 130–2
130 The Greek word *μόναχος* is derived from *μόνος*, meaning 'one alone,' 'single.'
131 CWE 27 131
132 Ibid
133 Ibid
134 Perhaps Erasmus is alluding facetiously to the O-antiphons, or 'the Great O's: seven *Magnificat* antiphons sung at the Vespers of the last seven days of Advent. He used the term 'asses' in *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 131.

be Pauls and Anthonys,[135] while at the same time they do not delight their minds with the study of sacred Scripture, nor do they understand in the least what evangelical charity is, but they are steeped in avarice, envy, anger, and the other vices of human nature.[136] Although these remarks and similar are spoken by Folly, they do no harm to honest people, and give a healthy warning to the dishonest. Certainly very many monks, who, aroused by warnings of this kind, have converted to the practice of genuine piety, express their thanks to me, proclaiming that they owe it to me that they have begun to be Christians. Since no mention is made here of their hidden crimes (which they themselves however daily publicize), while only those things are described that are both known to everyone and can be spoken of without offence in the presence of any of them, see how bitter a title Zúñiga has added: 'On monks, whose life, behaviour, and customs he mocks in extraordinary ways, just like any heathen, to the greatest dishonour of the church.' But how much gentler am I, the heathen, than those whom our mountebank pretends that he favours, who frequently in their sermons with great licence rave against the ways of life of priests, magistrates, married couples, unmarried women, and young people from what they have heard in the secrecy of the confessional, sometimes describing a situation in such a way that many people even recognize the character, and raving against priests in such a ways that they almost provoke the populace to take up stones. I know someone – he and his order shall be nameless – who in a sermon at Louvain told the gospel story of the woman caught in adultery.[137] After stating that in olden times it had been the custom among the Jews for adulterous women to be stoned, he added the joke: 'If the same were the case today, the whole of the pot-mountain[138] would not be sufficient.' (There is a hill there that takes its name from sherds, I suppose because it has been heaped up from rocks.) What could have been said that was more insulting to those in the married state, surely through this name holier than the state of the person who made this remark, because it has both been instituted by God and consecrated by Christ, and commended by the church through the title of sacrament? In fact what could be more useless for the purpose of correcting unchastity? Would any cohabiting woman

* * * * *

135 An allusion to the Apostle Paul and St Anthony of Padua, famous for their preaching (cf CWE 27 135)

136 CWE 27 131 and 135

137 John 7:53–8:11

138 Monte Testaccio in Rome, here transposed to Louvain, where as far as we know, no such place existed

or adulterous wife then have felt very bad about herself, when she heard that the number was so great? Who would not have understood that this remark had been prompted not by the guilty conscience of one person but by the idle gossip that they are in the habit of exchanging about what each of them has heard in the confessional?

Another member of the same order stated in a sermon that 'a woman would be guilty of a less grievous sin if she committed bestiality than if she had intercourse with a priest.' And when the clergy warned him to tone down this subject when addressing the people, he said things that were more shocking than what he had said before. So much confidence do the monk's robe and cowl inspire in some people, among both the uneducated and the foolish. There is no one who could not adduce hundreds of similar examples. This is what they call zeal for the faith, and they cannot bear that Folly should have made jokes about their voices, knots, and girdles,[139] though she does not criticize the appearance of those people but their reliance on these matters and the neglect of the things which would have been sufficient to be the sole objects of their care. Moreover, seeing that they do not show good faith in keeping secret what is entrusted to them in confession, would that they themselves ensure that it does not seem to have the appearance of truth. I can recount very many instances in which I found this to be absolutely true, with even the names of individuals made public; and there is virtually no one who could not describe some examples from his own experience. Then, the joke that Folly makes against the manner of preaching that some people unhappily strain after,[140] Zúñiga calls 'impiety.' And yet these things are spoken under the character of Folly; they are spoken in that work where no class of human beings escapes censure. The reader also understands how I have aimed at harmless and polite jokes, and what great concern I have avoided touching on the cubicle of mysteries,[141] which however are now all too well known to the common populace through the shameless behaviour of certain people. There are so many swarms of monks in the world; and will it not be permitted to utter a word, even in general, against them, even for the sake of warning, when they themselves spare neither rank nor reputation?

But so far the discussion has been about specific titles, so that the reader can understand from them how brazen Zúñiga is, whom some people have thought should be recruited into their camp, after Pfefferkorn's death

* * * * *

139 CWE 27 131
140 CWE 27 136
141 The tiny chamber of secrets, the confessional, a metaphor for confession itself

at Cologne.[142] Now, because it would be not only lengthy but also foolish to reply to each of them, here briefly is a summary of all Erasmus' blasphemies, impieties, and heresies.

I will begin with the saints.[143] Nowhere do I condemn the cult of the saints; on the contrary, I commend it in hundreds of places (with certain extreme Lutherans, so I hear, gnashing their teeth), but I criticize the superstition of those who worship them in a ridiculous, not to say impious manner, given that the saints are worshipped best by those who strive to imitate their way of life. I find fault with the common people, who credit their favourite saints with fictitious miracles, who ask of them things that it would be shameful to ask from a man of honour, and who attribute to them, from some human emotion, more than is right.

I nowhere condemn the church's institutional worship; but I give a warning that there should be a limit to the chants performed in churches and the prayers that are called 'of the hours,'[144] which we see increasing day by day; and I desire that there shall be nothing in them that is not drawn from the sacred scriptures, or certainly desire that the prayers of those whose writings savour of the apostolic spirit should be sung in clear, pure, and restrained settings, in such a way that both those who give voice to them may understand them and those who hear may be able to understand. Now no one is unaware of the kind of music that exists in most churches. I do not want this form of divine worship, consisting of an unintelligible clamour of voices and instruments, to seem predominant, since the common people think that this is all that religion consists of. Who could put up with this impiety, this form of worship, so frenzied, so haphazard?

In many places I express approval of ceremonies, because the primacy of the church's role is enhanced by them, because they remind us of spiritual things, and finally because they act like pedagogues leading the ignorant, nurses leading the infirm towards the mysteries of true religion. I only criticize those who insist on ceremonies to an exaggerated degree, who set their store by them, to the neglect of the things that produce genuine piety; who base their judgments of their neighbour on them, rather than on genuine

* * * * *

142 Johann Pfefferkorn (c 1469–1521/2) was a Jew converted to Christianity, who attacked Erasmus in 1517. He was a fanatic who wanted to convert all the Jews in Germany.

143 As Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-8 149) remarks, this summarizes three passages in which Zúñiga quotes from Erasmus' *Vita Hieronymi* and *Praise of Folly*.

144 Ie the priest's breviary, which was to be recited daily

vices or virtues. This is another distortion of religion that no one should tolerate.

I nowhere condemn without qualification pilgrimages to Compostela, Rome, or Jerusalem;[145] but in various places I take the opportunity to show that in former times men of proven sanctity did not regard them as all that important, and I criticize those who leave their wives and children at home – according to the teaching of the apostles they have a duty to care for them – and go off on a jaunt to Rome or Jerusalem, where they have no business to be.

I do not (as Zúñiga's utterly shameless lie asserts) condemn the rites of the church's worship, or the 'canonical hours,' as they are called,[146] but, on the basis of St Paul,[147] I deny that someone who intones psalms that he does not understand has achieved the pinnacle of the religious life. And I wish that a limit could be set on those prayers that are obligatory.[148] Again, I would like certain things that are mixed in with them, unworthy of sacred worship, to be removed. And this plethora of prayers does not take its immediate starting-point from the church, but from the superstition of certain people who are always adding something, with the connivance or even approval of bishops. For instance, at one time three lessons sufficed; subsequently we have come to a total of nine. The Benedictines, so I gather, have progressed to twelve. Perhaps others will proceed to twenty-one. Then again, the conclusion of certain supplications[149] is longer than the rest of the prescribed prayers. Each church pleases itself in these matters. What is more, some private individual often introduces ignorant legendary material, or rather printers assume the privilege of doing so, not only in the prayers of the hours but in the Mass, as

* * * * *

145 Erasmus mentions these three cities in the *Enchiridion*, saying that those who stay at home and look after their wives and children instead of going on pilgrimages would do a better thing, but he does not condemn them altogether. He himself made two visits to the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham in Norfolk.

146 A reaction to passages in Zúñiga's *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* in which the Spaniard criticizes *Annot in Matt* 6:7, *Annot in Joh* 14:26, *Annot in 1 Cor* 14:19, scholia on Jerome's *Ep* to Rusticus and on his *Ep* to Paulinus, and *Enarr in Ps I* (on 1, 2).

147 1 Cor 14:19 and *Annot* ASD VI-8 274:158–60

148 *Annot in Matt* 6:7 ASD VI-5 154:59–61

149 Specifically the short intercessory prayers addressed to various saints, recited at the end of lauds and vespers in certain parts of the church year

for instance in the hymns that are known as 'sequences,'[150] and sometimes in the Canon itself. Is admonition about these things a condemnation of divine worship?[151]

I nowhere call into question the authority of bishops. Rather, I recommend that they should be listened to as if they were Christ himself, if they teach doctrines that are worthy of Christ, and shine forth with lives that are worthy of Christ; that they should not be criticized, however, on account of the authority of their office and their rank, if they live irreligious lives, and if they enact unjust laws, but we should put up with them if they cannot be set right, as long as the demands they make are such as may make us poorer or wretched, but not wicked as well.[152] What sentiment could be expressed that is more moderate? Yet this will also be heresy, I expect, in Zúñiga's judgment.

See how far I am from condemning these men's holy and pious ordinances. I merely warn that we should not be burdened by them beyond what is reasonable, especially by human regulations, that is, those that lay down only measures that are not intrinsically conducive to the religion of the gospel: such as episcopal edicts concerning feast days,[153] the eating of fish or vegetables,[154] the reservation to themselves of cases, the redemption of jurisdiction renewable by an annual payment, the expansion of the prayers for liturgical hours, and innumerable other measures of this kind. I warn that primacy should be given to Christ's commandments, so that we do not attribute greater authority to mere human decisions than to the commandments of God. What unheard-of blasphemy! Zúñiga, in my opinion, will turn this order of priorities on its head.

About the sacraments of the church I both speak and think with reverence everywhere. I simply say somewhere in a couple of words that this form of confession, in which we now confess each of our faults and their circumstances, seems to me to derive from the hidden consultations in which

* * * * *

150 The sequence is a chant or hymn, composed in verse, following on the alleluia verse, hence the word sequence. In Erasmus' time there were many of them sung throughout the year, but in the missal of Paul V (1570) they were reduced to four: the *Victimae paschali laudes* for Easter Sunday, the *Veni, Sancte Spiritus* for Pentecost, the *Lauda Sion Salvatorem* for Corpus Christi, and the famous *Dies irae* for All Souls Day and in Masses for the dead.

151 As de Jonge says, Zúñiga criticized the *Ratio verae theologiae*, but under the heading of 'He condemns the celibacy of clerics,' not divine worship.

152 *Annot in Matt* 23:2 ASD VI-5 296–7:655–63; *Ratio* (Holborn 253:16–24)

153 *Annot in Rom* 14:5 ASD VI-7 326:236–7

154 Ep 858 (preface to the *Enchiridion*):458–60

some people use to reveal their secrets to bishops,[155] and I register this fact in such a way as to give notice that I am prepared to submit my opinion to the judgment of the church, when it has clearly taught me what its opinion is.

I make clear in many places that I include matrimony in the list of the sacraments that are properly called the sacraments of the church, if, however, the church has so included it, a fact that is not yet fully clear to me.[156] Although I see that the scholastics are in agreement,[157] and I see that appeal is made to the Council of Florence,[158] I merely indicate that the early theologians were of a different opinion, and that I doubt whether Jerome and Augustine held this view of marriage.[159] No conclusion can be drawn from this except that some of the early theologians were unaware of the seventh sacrament of the church, and that matrimony is not a sacrament according to the proper and exact definition of a sacrament.

I everywhere express veneration for the authority of teachers,[160] especially those who apart from their learning are commended by the holiness of their lives. However, I am reluctant to grant them the authority that is granted to the canonical books, and I would like to be permitted to dissent from them occasionally, while stopping short of insult and stubbornness. What blasphemy, worthy of stoning! Zúñiga, in my view, wants so much authority to be granted to the writings of men, because he considers his own books to be on a par with the apostolic scriptures.

Nowhere do I condemn scholastic theology as a whole;[161] I simply call it back, when it has descended too far into sophistic quibbles, to the sources of the sacred writings, and to discussion of questions that bear more closely on the life of faith. And I cannot accept the equation of various opinions of the scholastics, where they do not even agree among themselves, with the decrees of the faith. And yet if anything has crept in, either through the violation of tradition, or through the connivance of bishops, or through the abuse of good practice, so that freedom comes under pressure and Christian

* * * * *

155 *Annot in Act* 19:18 ASD VI-6 297–8:710–15
156 *Annot in 1 Cor* 7:39 ASD VI-8 176–8:339–57
157 Cf ibid ASD VI-8 178:359
158 The Council of Florence (1439) confirmed the list of seven sacraments.
159 *Annot in 1 Cor* 7:39 ASD VI-8 178 and *Annot in Eph* 5.32 ASD VI-9 254–8:383–426
160 Zúñiga in his *Erasmi blasphemiae and impietates* quoted from *Annot in Luc* 2:35 ASD VI-5 488:134–43 and *Annot in Matt* 11:12 ASD VI-5 198–9:172–7
161 A reaction to the part of Zúñiga's *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* in which he quoted *Annot in Matt* 11:30 ASD VI-5 206–8:345–73 and Ep 337:402–7

piety suffers harm,[162] I would not wish it to be changed through civil strife, but through the authority of rulers and popes;[163] and finally I warn that, being relatively free from human laws, we should not turn to more licentious ways, but all the more eagerly submit ourselves to the gentle yoke of Christ.[164] How many heresies there are here!

I have never either condemned or defamed any rank of society as a whole; on the contrary, I consider that I have been of some service to secular rulers by setting out, in the short volume that I devoted to this subject, what a Christian prince should avoid and what he should seek to achieve.[165] Moreover, occasionally (taking my cue from the sacred writings) I remind popes, bishops, and priests of their duty, and I have never had the feeling that any of them has up to now been angry with me for doing so: many have become my friends and well-wishers, and even benefactors.

There are so many orders of monks in the world,[166] whose authority I do nothing to undermine,[167] but in my opinion authority is due first to bishops and priests, who were undoubtedly instituted by Christ for the purpose of dispensing God's mysteries.[168] However, I sometimes take the opportunity of indicating what constitutes true religion and I criticize, with extreme moderation, certain people who dishonour their calling. If only there were not so many of them everywhere, so that we would be giving a misleading impression to no purpose.

I deny that I condemn the mendicant orders,[169] although it does not seem to me to enhance the dignity of monks that everywhere, on board ship,

* * * * *

162 Cf *Annot in Matt* 11:30 ASD VI-5 206–7:345–8.
163 Cf *Paraclesis* CWE 41 414.
164 Cf Matt 11:30.
165 *Institutio principis Christiani* (1516) ASD VI-1 133–219
166 *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 131
167 In his *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* Zúñiga quotes 15 passages from *Annot in Matt* 17:5; 21:19; *Annot in Ioh* 13:35; *Annot in 1 Cor* 3:8; *Annot in 1 Tim* 5:8; scholia on Jerome's *Ep* to Heliodorus; the *Antidotus*, an appendix to the scholia on Jerome's *Ep* to Rusticus; scholia on Jerome's *Ep* to Paula and Eustochium; Ep 858:382–4; *Enchiridion* (CWE 66 126–7); *Ratio* (CWE 41 609); *Adagia* III iii 1; *Moria* (CWE 27 130–2), all mentioned by de Jonge, ASD IX-8 155.
168 Erasmus probably is referring to *Annot in Matt* 16:18, which deals with papal authority. Cf Ep 140:23-6 and Erasmus' scholia on Jerome's letters, *Ep* 15 to Damasus, *Ep* 41 to Marcella, *Ep* 146 to Evagrius, *Hieronymi opera* (Froben: Basel 1537) II 129, 132, 330.
169 Zúñiga had quoted from *Annot in Luc* 2:12 ASD VI-5 476:824–8 and *Ratio* (CWE 41 616).

in taverns, even in private houses, they make a nuisance of themselves with their begging-boxes; sometimes, with a kind of scurrilous impudence, they engage in extortion rather than begging. However, I believe that those who are physically able would be displaying a greater measure of holiness if they were to work with their hands from time to time, and by so doing support both themselves and others. No doubt anyone who pens such heretical notions deserves to be torn limb from limb by all monks who are happy with their luxurious and leisured lifestyle; but Jerome penned more attacks on these people, when they were still relatively uncorrupted.[170]

I am rather hostile to warfare,[171] and everywhere, as far as the context allows, I counsel against war and urge peace. And yet I nowhere express abhorrence of war in such a way as to condemn it totally and without reservation. However, I do feel abhorrence for these wars that have involved Christian rulers in conflict for almost an entire century now – whether for sport or in earnest is uncertain. Certainly for the civilian population the game is not a pleasant one. I advise priests and monks to strive to ensure that disturbances of this kind do not arise, or that they should be resolved, rather than inciting rulers (who of their own accord are only too eager for such madness) to engage in them. I fervently desire that the bishop of Rome should be a peacemaker and not a warmonger, so that he may show that he is truly the vicar of Christ; and that he should not involve himself in this or that treaty, but be a common parent to all and look to everyone's good impartially. I do not wish the clergy to be contaminated by any kind of bloodshed. Serious heresy! Yet the ancient writers, who laid down the same principles that I advise, took the view that this was appropriate for the dignity of their status. And if we take figures from the past into account, it was king David, not a priest, who was told: 'You may not build a house for me,' for 'you are a man of blood.'[172] Nor do I anywhere condemn war against the Turks, but I indicate the reason why it should be waged. However, if I had been totally opposed to war, with what temerity would I, in the treatise 'On the Christian Prince,'[173] have deliberately set out the methods by which war should be

* * * * *

170 See eg Jerome *Ep* 125 to Rusticus.

171 De Jonge lists eight passages quoted by Zúñiga: *Annot in Luc* 3:14; scholia in Jerome's *Ep* to Laeta; the scholia and the *Antidotus* on Jerome's *Ep* to Geruntia; the *Antidotus* to Jerome's *Ep* to Hedibia; *Antidotus* to Jerome's *Ep* to Algaia; Ep 858:401–4; *Querela pacis* (CWE 27 307)

172 1 Chr 17:4 and 2 Sam 16:8

173 CWE 27 206–88 (1516). The last chapter of seven pages is entitled 'On starting war.'

undertaken and conducted? But if priests and theologians are possessed by this fear that we may not have our fill of wars, by all means let their prayers be answered: they have and will have in ample measure the object of their desire, unless I am mistaken.

There remains the last missile that Zúñiga fires at me, the primacy of the Roman pontiff.[174] My writings make clear how much I attribute to it. Certain Lutherans make it clear as well: they clamour that I play the role of flatterer, at least in this regard. I merely appear at one point to doubt whether this monarchical power which it now claims for itself has always belonged to it, that is, whether it was handed down by Christ,[175] and I do so, not with prior intention, but taking my cue from orthodox writers. At just one point[176] I indicate in a couple of words my sense that this monarchical power of the Roman pontiff originated after the time of Jerome: my query concerns not the pope's jurisdiction, but when that jurisdiction was assumed. It is quite clear that at one time it was not the custom to petition the pope for the confirmation of bishops and many other matters. If he were to give up these powers his jurisdiction would not thereby be infringed, but some of his executive role would pass to others. In the *Method*, where I put forward two propositions – one of which is beyond dispute, namely that the bishop of Rome is the leader of the entire church; the other is open to question, that is, whether this leadership derives from the authority of Christ, or from the consent of rulers and people – I add that I have put forward the latter simply for the sake of example, and that I do not demand that its expression should be given greater weight than is normally given to propositions that are put forward simply for teaching purposes. Neither here nor elsewhere do I make any assertion; as I have stated, I merely indicate to the reader a passage that should be pondered.

* * * * *

174 Here, Erasmus defends himself against remarks in the *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates*, quoting fifteen passages from works of Erasmus: *Annot in Matt* 10:2 and 16:18; *Annot in 2 Cor* 10:8; *Annot in 1 Pet* 5:3; scholia on Jerome, *Epitaphium Paulae*; on *Ep* to Innocentium; the *Censura* on Jerome's *Ep* to Damasus; scholia on his *Ep* to Marcella, against Montanus; the *Antidotus* to the *Ep* to Euagrius; Jerome's preface to the Gospels; passages from the *Annotatiuncula* to Cyprian's *Ep*; *Ratio* (CWE 41 541) and Ep 843:475–81, all listed by Henk Jan de Jonge.

175 The passage Erasmus alludes to has not been found.

176 Erasmus' *censura* of Jerome's *Ep* to Damasus

However, it is also no secret to me what cisalpine theologians[177] think about this matter. But I take no part in this debate. The Roman pontiff will possess no more power, even if I attribute supreme power to him; and he will lose none, however much I may deny to him. I will say this: more ill-feeling has been aroused against the bishop of Rome by certain people who see fit to exalt his status in extraordinary ways than by all the passages in which I remind readers about the matters that form the basis of the true status and authority of the popes; if they embraced this wholeheartedly they would be doing something both more auspicious and more brilliant than they are doing now, leaving aside any reference to the life of the world to come. If I knew that the bishop of Rome would be granted in fact what I attributed to him in words, I would not only make him infallible whenever he enacts any law, whenever he makes a pronouncement on morals or faith, whenever he interprets sacred Scripture for us, but I would also add the power of speaking in tongues,[178] of imparting the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands,[179] and of healing every variety of disease and casting out devils by his shadow and by contact with his clothing.[180] And I would attribute this power not only to the bishop of Rome but also to all bishops; for what could be more desirable than to have bishops of that kind? I will say nothing more on this matter at present. But if there are some aspects of the behaviour of certain popes (or of those who conduct the pope's business) that I find displeasing, that is something I have in common with those who are now going into battle on the pope's behalf against the Lutherans. They admit that there are very many things that should be put right, and already they are repeatedly demanding an ecumenical council. But if it is taboo to open one's mouth about the well-publicized misdeeds of popes, why do they tolerate Platina,[181] who described, even in detail, so many misdeeds in his attacks on many of the popes?

Leo[182] had read my *Praise of Folly*, and yet nonetheless he showed favour to Erasmus. And perhaps Rome is more grateful to me, after frequently

* * * * *

177 German reformers such as Martin Luther and Andreas Karlstadt who refused to accept the primacy of the Pope as a divine institution
178 Eg 1 Cor 12:30
179 Eg Acts 8:17
180 See Acts 5:15; Matt 9:18–26, Luke 8:40–56; Acts 19:12.
181 Bartolomeo Platina (1421–81) wrote the first history of the popes (*Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum* 1479).
182 Pope Leo X

receiving a dose of Attic wit at my hands, than to Zúñiga's pamphlet,[183] which praised the city in such a way that it thought itself mocked. Folly does not criticize the pope's authority, but the fact that he is completely immersed in worldly affairs and has no leisure to reveal the qualities that properly belong to the pope's office, and were revealed by the popes of early times.[184] She does not condemn the papal thunderbolt,[185] but the fact that he often hurls it when it is not appropriate. If that is always false, why is he sometimes forced to render null and void a sentence of excommunication that he has passed?

Since the actual evidence of my works makes clear that these things are so, see what a vicious conclusion Zúñiga adds to *his* work:[186] 'And so on,' he says; 'any reader can appreciate for himself that what follows is no less heretical than the extracts I have set out thus far, all of them from that book dictated by the devil's mouth, with countless other blasphemies put forward in the most insulting manner against every rank and order of Christianity.' I know that Zúñiga is not saying these things from genuine feeling, but that he has been hired and is acting a part; otherwise he would be foolish in the extreme to measure the rulers of church and state by the yardstick of his own character. They, to be sure, are endowed with better minds than some imagine. They understand what a great burden of affairs they bear on their shoulders. They rejoice to be instructed, they rejoice to be given warnings, as long as it is done without insult to anyone, as long as it is not done in a seditious spirit. They know that the greater the power they wield the more they have need of frank and friendly advice. How many bishops, how many princes, how many monks have expressed their thanks to me for the *Praise of Folly*, which my opponent says was dictated by the devil's mouth? What evil do I not caution against in *The Education of a Christian Prince*? No prince has ever taken offence. The most illustrious prince Ferdinand[187] thanked me in person for that work, which he learned by heart virtually word for word. The emperor Charles[188] not only thanked me but most generously rewarded me,

* * * * *

183 Zúñiga's *Epistola ad Pontificem noviter electum* (1522)
184 *Moria* (CWE 27 138–40)
185 Papal bulls
186 Zúñiga *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* fol G 3 r°, the final sentence of the work
187 Ferdinand I (1503–1564), brother of Charles V, Archduke of Austria, to whom Erasmus dedicated the second edition of the *Institutio principis Christiani*
188 Charles V (1500–58), Emperor from 1519, for whom Erasmus wrote the *Institutio principis Christiani* when he was awaiting an appointment as Charles' councillor (1516)

and would do so on an even more lavish scale if fortune did not smile on me with tranquillity rather than largesse. Or does Zúñiga think that everyone is a Thraso,[189] or so stupid as to be won over by such praises as those with which he has celebrated Rome and the recently elected pope?[190] If the devil dictates anything, he dictates libels such as those that Zúñiga writes, full of malice, that is, slander,[191] from which the one dictating takes his name.

I sense, most gracious reader, that you have long since grown sick of these plaintive ditties, and so I will let you go, after setting out the prefatory letter that forms the prelude to Zúñiga's fantasia of blasphemies and impieties.[192]

'Diego López Zúñiga to the faithful reader, greetings.'

'After a thorough reading of the *Annotations on the New Testament* and the commentary on the letters of St Jerome by Erasmus, and indeed of all his other works, I have found a number of passages in them that seemed in my judgment to be partly heretical, partly blasphemous, partly even insane and provocative, and not expressed with the reverence that they ought to have been. I therefore thought that I would be doing something worthwhile if I published all the passages, as I have selected them, so that by signalling them in this way I might make those who subsequently set out to read the works of Erasmus more wary, in case, having been lulled by the charm of his oratory and the sweetness of his style, they may unwittingly chance to swallow the poison that lies concealed beneath the honey, as very often happens to those who exercise no discrimination in what they read, and, whatever kind of work it may be, approve only what seems to be painted in rhetorical tints resembling flowers of various colours. To prevent this happening to those who read Erasmus' books I have carefully noted down, indicating as it were by means of certain signals, what one should beware of in them, showing what particularly deserves to be refuted, so that also at the same time, if there are any readers who wish to counter the insane and provocative views, the blasphemies and impieties that appear to fill his books to overflowing, they may, through my demonstration, have them ready to hand; indeed I give the reader this warning against each and every extract

* * * * *

189 See n104 above.
190 See n73 above.
191 Erasmus uses the Greek word *διαβολή* recalling 'devil' above.
192 The prefatory letter of Zúñiga *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* fol A 2 r°–v°. In the manuscript version of this Apologia, Erasmus noted in the margin: 'Here the preface should be written,' leaving the copying of the preface to an assistant.

from Erasmus that is contained in this pamphlet, having some time ago put together a volume divided into three books, which I will shortly undertake to have published.[193] And I believe the same should be done by everyone else who possesses any literary talent, so that our friend Erasmus may at last learn the lesson that the Catholic church, which he does not hesitate to attack violently from every quarter, contains people who not only are not afraid of his barbs (smeared though they are with poison) but are even capable of firing them back against their author with maximum force. But this will be done by each individual as he sees fit. I consider that I have done more than enough in being the first as it were to cast out the serpents from the places where they lurk within Erasmus' books, and also to have attempted to the best of my ability to crush their heads, and to have demonstrated plainly to the reader that the man is not only a Lutheran, but the standard-bearer and leader of the Lutherans, something that his writings clearly reveal, even if we were to remain silent. What their character is can easily be judged from what is set out below. Farewell, reader.'

Thus far Zúñiga. The first thing to notice is how carefully the man expresses himself. In the first position he puts 'heretical,' next 'blasphemous,' then 'insane,' followed by 'provocative,' and finally 'not expressed with the reverence that they ought to have been.' This is the way that rhetoricians bring a speech step by step to a climax, unless perhaps Zúñiga is preserving the Hebrew order: they write back to front. The same caution is displayed when, after beginning with blasphemies, heresies, and insanities, he adds for the sake of modesty, 'seemed in my judgment.' As I read this an amusing incident came into my mind. At one time, when I was living at Orleans,[194] I heard a kitchen-maid having a row with her mistress. Eventually the servant-girl, provoked by her employer, who was accusing her of something or other, retorted in French, 'You're a liar, begging your pardon.'[195] He em-

* * * * *

193 This is the original, longer version of Zúñiga's *Erasmi Roterodami blasphemiae et impietates ex eiusdem Annotationum libro in Novum Testamentum excerptae, cum Stunicae confutatoriis contra eundem annotamentis*, written in 1520 or 1521. The popes and the Roman curia never allowed Zúñiga to publish this work. It survives in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples, a presentation copy intended to be offered to Leo X.

194 Erasmus lived in Orléans from September to December 1500 to evade the plague in Paris. In August 1506 he stayed there again for a few days on his journey from London via Paris to Italy.

195 The French which Erasmus translates into Latin may have been something like '*sauf vostre honneur*.'

ploys a similar reticence shortly afterwards, when he says, 'so that also at the same time, if there are any readers who wish to counter the insane and provocative views, the blasphemies and impieties that appear to fill his books to overflowing,' etc. A severe criticism, if he had not said 'appear to.'

What a paltry selection he has assembled from my complete works! And there is nothing in these extracts that is heretical or blasphemous. Certainly no one is less guilty than I am of making assertions: there is scarcely any passage in which I do not assume an impartial role. Now he is encouraging others to write against Erasmus' blasphemies and insanities, but in such a way that the first accolade for doing so should be reserved for Zúñiga, who has spilled out every kind of poison, who has some time ago written against them a volume divided into three books.[196] This is the usual method of dividing volumes into three books. He believes the same should be done by everyone else who possesses any literary talent, no doubt meaning a talent equivalent to his own. Gather round, then, all you shining literary talents: you have Zúñiga as your standard-bearer. Hasten, sharpen your pens, against the one and only Erasmus. But Zúñiga is crying out in vain for Hylas.[197] There will be no one, among those endowed with literary talent, so barefaced or deranged as to take on the task of imitating his example. But now listen to the words of the Areopagite:[198] 'so that our friend Erasmus may at last learn the lesson that the Catholic church, which he does not hesitate to attack violently from every quarter, contains people who not only are not afraid of his barbs (smeared though they are with poison) but are even capable of firing them back against their author with maximum force.' Bravo! Bully for the Catholic church! Zúñiga has arisen to defend her. The danger is over. In her hour of need the church has been rescued by her Camillus.[199]

Do I, who have spent so many sleepless nights assisting the study of languages and of good literature, who have given so much advice and instruction to princes, bishops, and citizens, who have published so many volumes to promote the study of theology; because in a few places I criticize human behaviour (and even then without insulting any individual), attack the church violently? And does Zúñiga with his vitriolic tongue defend, support, protect, adorn, and give lustre to it? Christ's church has no need of such

* * * * *

196 The original version of the *Erasmi blasphemiae et impietates* that had been forbidden (note 4)
197 *Adagia* I iv 72: 'said of people who shout in vain or don't make any progress'
198 Proverbial, *Adagia* I ix 41, 'a severe and unimpeachable judge' (de Jonge)
199 A reference to Marcus Ulpius Camillus, a legendary Roman dictator and hero

defenders, who in the most shameless way twist words that have been spoken in absolute honesty, who bombard the head of someone who deserves well with scurrilous abuse as if from a wagon.[200] If the church was happy with a defender of that type, the leaders of the church would not twice have forbidden Zúñiga's book to be put on sale.[201] What is more, he would not have been able to rant like this with impunity, if the delay to the pope's arrival in Rome had not caused everything to go into suspended animation.[202]

The Catholic church, he says, still contains men who can forcefully return abuse. Rather, it is something that causes grief to the Catholic church, that within its net[203] it still hauls in the wicked mixed in with the good, that it is forced to tolerate, among the useful fish, stingrays and sea hares, and that it has to yield, mixed in with the wheat, not only darnel but also wolfsbane.[204] The day has not yet arrived when the angels of God will come and remove all causes of sin from Christ's kingdom.[205]

Nor does he make an end of this Catholic preface without pronouncing me 'not only a Lutheran, but the standard-bearer and leader of the Lutherans.' First, what could be more shameless than to call me a Lutheran on the basis of what I wrote before Luther became known, just as if one were to call Origen a Pelagian.[206] What a brave defender of the Catholic church, who would dare to tell such lies on behalf of the bride of Christ[207] as brazen-facedly[208] to call someone who has never had any dealings with a single Lutheran 'the standard-bearer and leader of the Lutherans.' Perhaps some Lutherans would have wished that what Zúñiga strongly asserts were true. But they are

* * * * *

200 *Adagia* I vii 74, 'Cartloads of abuse'

201 Professor de Jonge points out that Erasmus is probably not referring here to a prohibition issued by Leo X in 1521, but to two prohibitions issued by the cardinals after Leo's death on 1 December 1521 and before the arrival of Adrian VI in Rome by the end of August 1522.

202 Adrian VI, until then Bishop of Tortosa in Spain, was elected Pope in January 1522 but did not arrive in Rome until the end of August 1522.

203 Cf Matt 13:47, Luc 5:2–6.

204 A reference to the parable of the tares, Matt 13:24–30; 36–43

205 An allusion to Matt 13:41: 'The Son of Man will send his angels, and they will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers.'

206 Origen (third century) was an ardent believer in free will while the Pelagian heresy began at the beginning of the fifth century. Therefore the comparison with the difference in age between Erasmus and Luther is quite exaggerated.

207 Cf Eph 5:25–7 for the church as the bride of Christ.

208 *Adagia* I vii 47, literally, 'to put a bold front on it'

refuting the utterly shameless and hollow man on my behalf, as they prepare to vent their rage against their leader with stinging pamphlets.

Just as I cannot hate the truth, in whichever author's works it may be found, so I have never consented to be either the leader or an associate of any faction. And indeed in my view it is sometimes more expedient in human affairs to abandon to some extent the cause of truth than to involve everything in turmoil. Personally, just as I have never attached myself to any faction, so I have not allowed anyone to join my side. There were many factors that could have pushed me into the Lutheran camp. From the one side I received invitations, allurements, pressures; from the other, enmities propelled me in that direction. And I did not fail to foresee that if their plan of silencing Luther succeeded they would straightaway fix their sights on me, and on secular literature, which they hate just as bitterly as they do Luther. But not even the thought of the danger I was in made me budge from my basic Christian outlook. There were plenty of people who wished it to be known that they were my patrons, but I told them all to keep away. I wanted to be on my own, so as not to give any impression of partisanship. I wanted to be the common property of all, so as to be able to deserve well of everyone. I loathed dissension in all its forms: in its early stages I tried to keep it at bay, and now that it is widespread I have tried to put out the flames. A strange standard-bearer for the Lutherans![209]

But this is most clearly to be seen, he says, from the poison that I have gathered up from all his books. Rather, it is clear from these very matters that Zúñiga has no shame. Although this remark was dropped by some camel[210] or other in his cups, several pettifoggers of the same nature had already for some time been doing so at Louvain. 'There is nothing in Luther's books,' they say, 'that is not to be found equally in those of Erasmus.' And this mantra is circulated by the myopic and the lame; if they were to make these claims when my books had been destroyed they would be nothing other than sycophants, but now, since my writings are the common property of educated people, they cannot appear as anything other than insane to those who read what I write.

* * * * *

209 'Standard-bearer for the Lutherans' is a title bestowed on Erasmus by Zúñiga.

210 'A camel': a pun on the prior of the Carmelites at Louvain, Nicolaus Baechem Egmondanus (1462?–1526), who in his sermons accused Erasmus of having Lutheran ideas.

I have read the articles that have been condemned by the three academies and by the bull of Leo.[211] There were many things in them that I had never even dreamed of in my whole life; many whose import I completely fail to understand; many whose content is entirely contrary to what I teach in my writings; and nothing in any of them that clearly agrees with Luther. I am speaking of what he has written: what each individual thinks, it is not within human capacity to discern. Just as it is never permissible to distance oneself from the declared doctrines of the Catholic church, so there exist, in the books of certain authors who seem to pursue the church's line with more enthusiasm than good sense, opinions concerning which it is not heretical to express doubt, or even possibly dissent. And there is no question at the moment that I should either rebut or defend Luther's teaching, but that I should show that what these people – raging devils rather than men – bandy about is the most shameless lie of all. If what these people proclaim is true, how is it that the Lutherans attack my books? How is it that those who write against Luther frequently adduce supporting texts from my works as well? Are works that are condemned by Lutherans in agreement with Luther? Or works with which his enemies attack Luther? But, he will say, Lutheran renegades are angry with him. On the contrary, let me be the chorus-master of all the Lutherans if I did not before anyone else advise against this undertaking: whether they think it should be put down to my stupidity, or ignorance, or timidity, I certainly did so strenuously. Let me be Luther himself, if I have ever been associated by word with any Lutheran.

I knew that there could be no dearer possession than that of learned friends – certainly none has ever given greater pleasure to me – and yet I preferred to accept the loss of that possession (extremely painful though it was) than to be either a promoter or an initiator of strife. Many people, formerly friends, have become enemies; some have become alienated,[212] a few have persevered in friendship,[213] though they all loved Erasmus before Luther began to be noticed by the world. And among them the majority are not only learned but good men. How can they be good men, someone will say, if they favour Luther? Rather, they favour the teaching of the Gospel, and they

* * * * *

211 Most likely the composite volume of Luther's writings addressed to Leo x beginning with the words, *Resolutiones disputationum de virtute indulgentiarum,* Froben, 1518; The three theological faculties of the universities of Cologne, Louvain, and Paris, and the bull 'Exsurge Domine' (15 June 1520)

212 For instance Ulrich von Hutten, Johannes Oecolampadius and Wolfgang Capito

213 Including Thomas More, Ulrich Zasius, Beatus Rhenanus, and Conrad Goclenius

consider that this cause was initiated by Luther. And who at the outset did not favour Luther? To be sure, there were some things that the world could no longer tolerate. And we are rapt by some aspiration of fate towards the purity and simplicity of ancient pristine theology. This aspiration cannot be bludgeoned out of people's minds by any number of cries of horror, bulls, edicts, punishments, pamphlets; to such an extent that I am afraid that unless the roots from which this evil has already so often begun to sprout again are cut out it will at some stage burst forth with even more disastrous results. Following the example of Jeroboam[214] we impose such a heavy yoke, and we do not remember that he came to a bad end.[215] Terror and threats are employed, while the affair has taken over a good part of the entire world; and there are certain people like Zúñiga involved in this drama who are pursuing their own agenda, but in the meantime subverting the church's agenda. This is the aim of these people: they are eager to destroy the whole world by fire, as long as they gain power.

But I am optimistic that the irreproachable honesty, learning, holiness, and wisdom in worldly affairs of the new pope will put an end to these evils, especially with the help of the emperor Charles. Since the latter is so powerful that he can do virtually what he likes, it is very much to be hoped that he will constantly do what is right; and since his character is such that he is attracted with great ardour to what is best, Christ, the best and greatest, yielding to the prayers of his church, will add either sufficient judgment for him to discern what is best, or sufficient success for him to consent to the most beneficial advice.

Finally, let them both entrust the governance of the Christian religion to selected men of irreproachable lives, who will neither abuse the power of the emperor nor make the authority of the pope hateful to the world, but will advance the cause of Christ with wholehearted commitment. His work is done whenever private aspirations are set aside and thought is given to true religion. If this is done the whole world will applaud.

However, to break off rather than finish what I began: I consider Zúñiga to be entirely unworthy of a response, since he is a complete mountebank;

* * * * *

214 Erasmus is in error here. He cites Jeroboam instead of Rehoboam, Solomon's son and successor as king of Israel. The latter laid a heavy yoke on his people, but Jeroboam rebelled, asking Rehoboam to lighten the burden. He refused, and eventually Jeroboam became king of the ten northern tribes whereas Rehoboam was allowed to keep only the house of Juda and the tribe of Benjamin. See 1 Kings 12:14.

215 The kingdom fell apart into a northern and a southern one.

but because I saw that this age is thoroughly corrupt and that the greatest licence is allowed to malicious tongues, I wanted to warn all interested parties beforehand, as if by means of a prophylactic, against Zúñiga's blasphemies, impieties, insanities, and poisonous accusations.[216]

We await three books: one should form one's opinion about them from a single passage, in which, contrary to every opportunity, he brings a charge of double heresy; and I have no doubt that he has chosen this passage as his principal accusation,[217] from which he can provide a specimen and foretaste of the work to come. In fact, from these three passages,[218] defended by Sancho[219] in a learned, theological, and scholastic manner, one will be able to form a judgment, just like judging a lion by his claws. We await many hundreds of blasphemies and impieties, of insanities and provocative assertions, of poisonous accusations, heresies, and Lutheranisms. Take many precautions against them with an antidote, whoever does not wish to be infected, and farewell, reader. Basel, 13 June 1522.

END OF THE APOLOGIA

* * * * *

216 This was the original ending of the book; Erasmus later added the last sentences.
217 Ie the criticism on *Annot in Act* 4:27
218 Ie John 1:1; Acts 4:27; Eph 5:32
219 Sancho Carranza de Miranda (d 1531), who wrote a critique on Erasmus' New Testament including the annotations; on Carranza, see the introduction, pp ix–x.

This page intentionally left blank

APOLOGIA AGAINST ZÚÑIGA'S 'PRECURSOR'

Apologia ad Prodromon Stunicae

translated and annotated by
ERIKA RUMMEL

(ASD IX-8 187–206; LB IX 375–381)

APOLOGIA AGAINST ZÚÑIGA'S 'PRECURSOR'

Just as this apologia[1] was being printed, and before the last page was reached, a booklet of Zúñiga was delivered to me rather conveniently. He had entitled it *Precursor* because it was to be the forerunner of the three books in which he promised to put the final touches to his maliciousness.[2] He had already brought out some short precursory booklets,[3] of a kind that prepared the minds of scholars and all good men to expect from him nothing but great impudence, ignorance, and insanity.

In the preface to this book he repeats those mad headings with which he distinguished his book of *Blasphemies and Impieties*,[4] except that he outdoes himself in impudence and even ignorance. On the basis of his first annotations, I thought there was a glimmer of wit in the man – I was clearly wrong.

* * * * *

1 That is, Erasmus' *Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi*, completed on 6 August 1522. For the translation of this text see pp 241–85 above

2 *Libellus trium illorum voluminum praecursor, quibus Erasmicas impietates ac blasphemias redarguit* (A short forerunner of the three volumes, in which he counters Erasmus' impieties and blasphemies, Rome 1522). This was the 'precursor' to a longer version of 'Erasmi Roterodami blasphemiae et impietates' (Erasmus of Rotterdam's Blasphemies and impieties), which remained in manuscript, however. See below, p 304 n4.

3 Presumably a reference to Zúñiga's *Erasmi Roterodami Blasphemiae et impietates nunc primum propalatae ac proprio volumine alias redargutae* (Erasmus of Rotterdam's Blasphemies and impieties now first proffered, to be refuted elsewhere in its proper volume, Rome 1522), and *Epistola ad Pontificem noviter electum* (A letter to the newly elected pontiff, Rome 1522). Erasmus may also have thought of Zúñiga's *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralatione Novi Testamenti* (Annotations against Erasmus of Rotterdam in Defence of the New Testament Translation, Alcalá 1520), although that work can hardly be termed *libellus,* a 'short' book.

4 In his *Precursor* Zúñiga cites ten of the headings he had used in the earlier *Erasmi Roterodami Blasphemiae et impietates nunc primum propalatae* (see above, n3).

Thereafter he deals with three statements defended by Sancho Carranza,[5] yet gives no thanks to his herald, although Carranza respectfully mentions Zúñiga's name so many times. Nor does he imitate Horace's joke about a man, who called his brother 'Mutius' so that he would be 'Marcus Tullius' to him in turn.[6] Both men[7] lived, or to put it more aptly, carried on in Rome; both published their respective book in Rome in the same year. It appears, however, that Sancho was in the lead, for his book came out on 1 March. And yet Zúñiga, who deals with the same subject, mentions neither the author nor his booklet. How much praise Sancho deserves, will become clear from my response.[8] He certainly brought together such a mass of arguments out of the books of the theologians, that it was most impudent of Zúñiga to undertake writing about the same subject in Carranza's wake, and in such a frigid and boorish manner, especially when the matter itself proclaims that he had read the arguments he uses in the book of his colleague.

Thus, there is nothing new in Zúñiga's booklet. The pages are filled with recitations of material Carranza had noted before him, and which I answered. He would have supplied a very apt title to his responses if he had called them 'incriminations' instead of 'recriminations.'[9] For who would call a civil defence against an abusive attack a 'recrimination'? Or is there anything else in these booklets of Zúñiga's but effrontery and scurrilous abuse?

I shall proffer only one point, from which you can guess how much bitterness there is in Zúñiga's heart after he has spent twenty years studying Holy Writ – a man who is a true theologian, not a spurious theologian like myself, even though he has no diploma, no distinguished cap with white fur, and does not sport the proud title 'Magister noster,'[10] but is a theologian

* * * * *

5 Sancho Carranza, *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi Annotationes* (Short tracts against some of Erasmus' annotations, Rome 1522). For Erasmus' reply, see pp 161–240 above.

6 Horace *Ep* 2.2.87–90, referring to two brothers who praised each other in such extravagant terms that they appeared to rival the famous second-century orators Quintus Mucius Scaevola and Gaius Gracchus. Erasmus here substitutes the orator Marcus Tullius Cicero for Gracchus. Zúñiga failed to imitate the brothers' example by not returning Carranza's praises.

7 That is, Zúñiga and Carranza

8 See n5 above.

9 Zúñiga had used the heading 'recriminations' for his responses.

10 Professors of theology were addressed as 'Magister noster'; the tufted cap signified their status. Erasmus sarcastically quotes Zúñiga's claim that he had spent 'twenty years and more on reading Holy Writ and going through the commentaries of the old exegetes of the church' whereas Erasmus had 'suddenly turned

like those men of old, Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Jerome.[11] Although our friend López recounted a great deal in his annotation to show that marriage was called a sacrament, he said nothing that contradicted me. I do not deny that marriage is rightly called a sacrament; rather I noted that on the basis of that passage in Paul[12] it cannot very well be proved that marriage is one of the seven sacraments of the New Testament according to the strict definition of the word. Since his whole argument went on 'beyond the olive trees,'[13] as the saying goes, I admonished him to remember, if he wanted to engage with me, that the word *sacramentum* had two meanings in the books of the theologians: Sometimes it denoted the sign of a sacred thing, at other times it was a sacred sign consisting of the visible form but also producing an invisible and special grace in us, as by a divine pact. Here Zúñiga laughs heartily and ridicules me in amazingly boorish fashion for teaching such obvious things to such a distinguished theologian. For who hasn't read Peter Lombard's first distinction in book 4,[14] he asks. In that case, it is all the more shameful that Zúñiga, that great theologian, does not know what can clearly be read in a very well-known author. If he did know that Lombard's whole argument depends on this distinction, why does he pour out so many words in vain?

I denied that one could definitely conclude from that passage in Paul that marriage was a sacrament in the sense that term is used today of the seven sacraments of the church. Yet I state that I do not doubt it. This was my point – Zúñiga should have aimed his arguments at that. Let him see for himself whether there is anything in the many arguments he proffers that goes against me. Let us grant Zúñiga that *mysterium* and *sacramentum* are the same thing – in that case he has shown that marriage can be called a sacrament somehow; he has not proved that it is a sacrament according to the exact definition of the word we are dealing with. If we do not grant him (as he

* * * * *

from an unknown grammarian into a theologian' and had 'perhaps been presented with some sort of diploma' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge ASD IX-8 189). The last remark is aimed at the fact that Erasmus had acquired his doctorate in theology at Turin *per saltum*, that is, without going through an accredited programme of studies.

11 That is, like the Church Fathers Jerome (347–420 AD), Chrysostom (d 407 AD), and Gregory of Nazianzen (329–390 AD) who lived at a time when universities did not exist and theologians needed no formal accreditation.

12 Eph 5:32

13 That is, beyond the prescribed limit; see *Adagia* II ii 10.

14 Peter Lombard *Sentences* PL 192 841–2, quoted in full p 291 below

perhaps assumes) that *mysterium* means the same thing to the Greeks as our *sacramentum*, he cannot even prove on the basis of this passage that marriage is a sacrament in some sense.

It is even more amazing that he ridiculed my distinction ad nauseam in his little book and still couldn't remember it in his discussion. He cites for my benefit the words of Peter Lombard in Book 4, distinction 2, and derides me as a *theologaster* – a pseudo-theologian who overlooked even such a well-known passage. I will therefore be justified in turn to admire the recondite erudition and accurate and well-rounded judgment of his – a theologian without a doctoral cap, for I will not say 'without a brain,' when he did not realize that this was the very passage that uniquely proved my point. I said that the theologians of old and indeed 'Peter Lombard himself did not number marriage among the sacraments of the church' according to the precise definition of the term. And in support of this opinion, I quote Durandus.[15] The words of Peter Lombard, which Zúñiga cites, are as follows:[16] 'Let us now turn to the sacraments of the New Testament, which are baptism, confirmation, blessing of the bread (that is, the Eucharist), penance, extreme unction, ordination, marriage.' Zúñiga shouts a triumphal Hurrah! He has taught us that marriage is called a sacrament in some sense in the New Testament. But I admitted even more: that it was a sacrament according to the exact definition of a sacrament. That, however, was not Peter Lombard's meaning (I said). When Zúñiga, who is a theologian comparable to Nazianzen,[17] attacked my words, he adduced this passage – a weapon that will be his immediate downfall. For the passage continues: 'Some of these provide remedies for sins and confer supporting grace, such as baptism, others are merely a remedy, such as marriage, others again strengthen us with grace and virtue, such as the Eucharist and ordination.' Thus far I have quoted Peter's words, from which it is clear that in his opinion marriage does not confer sacramental grace. For his words are preceded at the beginning of his first Distinction by the following: 'In a sacrament, properly speaking, there is the sign of God's grace

* * * * *

15 Durandus of St Pourçain (1270–1334) in his commentary on Lombard's *Sentences*, 4, dist 26, qu 3; On him, see also below, *Apologia ad conclusiones*, n143.

16 Lombard, *Sentences* 4.2.1 PL 192 841–2

17 The Church Father Gregory of Nazianzen; see n11 above. Zúñiga had practically compared himself with Nazianzen. He wrote that the Church Father was regarded as a great theologian on account of his eloquence and his scriptural knowledge, adding: 'Not that I claim eloquence or Scriptural erudition, but to show by this example that one can be called … eloquent without scholastic titles' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge ASD IX-8 193).

and the invisible form of grace, such that it bears its image and is its cause.'[18] If this definition applies to marriage, what he says at the beginning of the second Distinction is incorrect, namely, that marriage is only a remedy, does not confer grace, that is, does not counter sin, and does not give us strength to advance in piety. If the definition does not apply, it follows that marriage is not a sacrament in the precise sense of the term. And this is the passage Zúñiga uses to strike down the wretched Erasmus with such superciliousness that you could think it was Augustine or Jerome speaking rather than Zúñiga – if those Church Fathers ever disputed with a manifest heretic.

Although his arguments are so stupid that Coroebus[19] would hardly have proffered them, let me tell you something even more stupid. He says that Latin *sacramentum* has exactly the same meaning as *mysterium* in Greek. Although this is completely wrong and needs no refutation among those who know Latin, I shall grant it to him since it has no bearing on this matter. In its broader sense, Zúñiga says, either word applies to many things that are not sacraments of the church, of which there are only seven that fit the strict definition of the term. From these words it is clear that Zúñiga is dealing with sacraments in their strict definition, which the theologians of old did not apply to marriage, although more recent theologians did, and the Council of Florence[20] confirmed the latter opinion, they say. This [Eph 5:32], and no other passage, proves marriage to be a sacrament, Zúñiga says. Therefore anyone denying that it can be proved on the basis of this passage, denies that marriage is a sacrament of the church. Now consider the acumen of this theologian, dear reader. First he explains diligently that the Greek and Latin words have the same meaning and that both are ambiguous since they are applicable equally to things that are and are not sacraments of the church. If this is so, how can one draw firm conclusions about such an important question from an ambiguous word?

Anyone who denies that marriage is a sacrament in this precise sense is a heretic![21] And this can be concluded from that one and only passage in Paul. Thus anyone who denies that this conclusion can be drawn is a heretic. If we can clearly deduce from it what Zúñiga claims, why did those

* * * * *

18 *Sentences* 4.1.2 PL 192 839

19 The proverbial fool (*Adagia* II ix 64)

20 Declaring marriage a sacrament, the Council of Florence (1438–45) cited Eph 5:32 as a proof text.

21 According to Zúñiga, if Erasmus denied that Eph 5:32 could serve as proof, he effectively 'gave the heretic Luther a handle to deny that marriage was a sacrament' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge ASD IX-8 193).

theologians of old not understand this clear passage? Indeed, why does Peter Lombard deny what the church later defined, as they say? Did such a great man not understand Paul when he spoke so clearly?

And observe what grave accusation Zúñiga brings against his colleague Sancho. For not only does Sancho say that the matter cannot be proved on the basis of that passage in Paul, but that it cannot be proved from other scriptural passages either.[22] It cannot be demonstrated with any suitable arguments, and he was convinced that it was so only on the strength of the authority of the church. Clearly Sancho is therefore stuck with the obvious accusation of heresy, together with Erasmus – according to Zúñiga's judgment.

Furthermore, if *mysterium* means the same as *sacramentum*, and *mysterium* is likely better known to Latin-speakers than *sacramentum*, how can I be said to deny the sacrament if I use a word in my translation that means the same thing? Indeed, when I leave untouched the word used by the apostle? Do I not believe that Christ is the Saviour of the world because I call him 'Messiah' or 'Anointed'?

But, Zúñiga says, they are commonly called the seven 'sacraments' of the church. So what? Does that mean I am not allowed to use that word in any other sense? Paul used the term in a different sense in more than one place, for example, in Ephesians [1:9]: 'Having made known to us the mystery [*sacramentum*] of his will'; and again, in the same letter, chapter 3[:3]: 'Because by revelation he made known to me the mystery [*sacramentum*]'; again in Colossians 1[:27]: 'to make known the riches of the glory of his mystery [*sacramentum*]'; also in Timothy:[23] 'Great is the mystery [*sacramentum*] of godliness.' Similarly, the word *sacramentum* occurs frequently in the Old Testament, although those passages do not deal with the seven sacraments of the church.

But on this point I have given a more than sufficient response to Sancho.[24] Since Zúñiga carries on in this unfortunate manner in the wake of Sancho, observe how vaingloriously he applauds himself: 'Since this is so,' he says, 'let Erasmus, that pseudo-theologian, go on and say that Zúñiga is not on his home turf,' and more of the same in such braggard fashion that

* * * * *

22 In his *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi annotationes* (Short Work against some of Erasmus' annotations, Rome 1522), Carranza wrote: 'I openly admit that this cannot be proved … from that passage' (full quotation in ASD IX-8 195).

23 1 Tim 3:16

24 See pp 234–40 above.

Thraso[25] seems nothing by comparison. I shall add only that Zúñiga accuses me totally wrongly when he says I believe that the sacrament of marriage is a human institution. Rather, in more than one place, I say that marriage was instituted by God in paradise,[26] showing however, that more recent theologians made pronouncements about the sacrament of marriage, on which there was no agreement among the theologians of old. If that is incorrect, let Zúñiga refute it.

Leaving this arena behind, in which he is so unqualified that he did not even understand what Sancho wrote, he goes on to his own field, that is, 'the horse into the plain,'[27] in which he is very well qualified. Putting on a bold face, he preaches that Luther took his opinion on marriage from my writings, whereas I attest numerous times in my response to Lee that I do not doubt that marriage is one of the seven sacraments, and is so according to the precise definition of sacrament; and I teach the same thing in the short tract entitled *In Praise of Marriage*; and likewise in a poem that has already been reprinted innumerable times, in which I treat of the power and use of the seven sacraments of the church;[28] and I clearly attest to the same thing in the annotation on the very passage in which I used the translation *mysterium* rather than *sacramentum*.[29] Given all that, how did I provide a handle for Martin Luther to deny that marriage is a sacrament of the church? If that man had subtracted only one of the sacraments, it certainly does not appear that I provided him with a reason to do so rather than Peter Lombard or Durandus or Jerome, who seem to be less generous in their remarks on marriage. Indeed I have indicated some passages in [Jerome's] writings in order to justify rather than to confirm them, [30] although it is probable that Jerome did not place marriage among the sacraments of the church according to the precise meaning of the word the church now uses to define the seven sacraments. But now that Luther has removed practically all sacraments,[31] it is even less plausible that he derived the idea from my writings.

* * * * *

25 That is, a braggart like Thraso, a character in Terence's comedy *Eunuchus*
26 For example, in his *Praise of Marriage* CWE 25 130–1 and in his apologia against Lee, CWE 72 302
27 Proverbial, to indicate the area in which someone is at his best (*Adagia* I viii 82)
28 See n26 above, and Poem 49 CWE 85 97.
29 In his annotation on Eph 5:32 where he says: 'That marriage is a sacrament should not be doubted' (CWE 58 209)
30 In his scholia on Jerome's Epistle to Eustochium, CWE 61 193
31 Luther recognized only three sacraments: baptism, the Lord's Supper, and absolution.

Furthermore, the theologians of Paris and others who have made every effort to refute the errors of Luther, attested that he had taken his arguments from the books of Jan Hus, the Valdensians, and Wycliffe.[32] And on this subject, too, Zúñiga promises us a tract which he wants to entitle 'Parallels between Erasmus and Luther,'[33] in which he will explain where I agree with Luther. No doubt, my views on marriage will be one of the principal parallels – but consider the extent of my agreement with him. I say that it is a sacrament of the church according to the precise meaning of the word 'sacrament,' disagreeing in this with Peter Lombard and the theologians of old, and agreeing with the definition of the church. Luther, they say, categorically denies that marriage is a sacrament. I have praised marriage to such an extent that I was in danger of being falsely accused of heresy in Louvain,[34] as if I attributed too much value to marriage. Luther's own books attest to how much he attributes to marriage. Let the reader guess on the basis of this one 'parallel' what the rest will be like. Surely, there is no more agreement between Luther and myself than, as Flaccus says,[35] 'between serpents and birds, between tigers and sheep.' And here you have his 'book of agreements' for which certain monks in Louvain and Cologne worked themselves into a sweat.[36]

And so the book grew in bulk, filled with sycophancies and silly nonsense – for they tried to obtrude it on the Most Reverend Girolamo Aleandro,[37] who was at that time apostolic legate in our region. Although Aleandro was then conducting an investigation into Luther and was, according to

* * * * *

32 Jan Hus (c 1372–1415), Peter Valdes (1140–1218), founder of the Valdensian movement, John Wycliffe (c 1330–84), all considered forerunners of the Reformation and branded as heretics

33 In his *Precursor* Zúñiga spoke of a booklet entitled *Erasmi ac Luterii parallela* (Parallels between Erasmus and Luther), which he was about to publish. For the full quote see ASD IX-8 197.

34 Jan Briart of Ath (1460–1520), theology professor at Louvain, had criticized Erasmus' *Praise of Marriage*. See Ep 1126:210–14.

35 Horace *Ars poetica* 13

36 Here as in his *Apologia against Zúñiga's Blasphemies and impieties* (see p 248 above) Erasmus suggests that Zúñiga has had helpers in writing this attack on him.

37 Girolamo Aleandro (c 1480–1542), papal legate in Germany from 1520 and charged with the implementation of the papal bull 'Exsurge Domine'; Erasmus' relationship with Aleandro was ambivalent. He suspected the legate of scheming against him (see Ep 1218:11–17), but tried to stay on his good side (see Ep 1342:120–3).

the poisonous tongues of certain men, 'rather irate against me,' he nevertheless rejected the book, not only because he knew that the matter was ridiculous and stupid, but also because he realized that persuading the people that Erasmus thought like Luther would not help at all in suppressing him. And yet these stupid people thought this was a clever plan and did not care about what they were doing or saying, as long as it served their private interests. They talked about serving 'faith' and 'the pope,' but I'll wager that there isn't one among them who doesn't value a fine dinner more than the pope together with the Catholic faith. And they carry on in a manner that they couldn't do better if they wanted to make all good people loathe the pope. And Zúñiga dons their plumage to recommend himself, and as their hired actor puts on a sycophantic play. How wonderfully decent of him to act like that! He couldn't be more boorish, impudent, or stupid. That's the actor those aediles[38] deserve.

He is amazingly savage in his prefaces, titles, and maledictions. But when he comes to the subject itself, he meekly admits that *mysterium* and *sacramentum* mean the same, but Erasmus does not seem to believe that marriage is one of the seven sacraments. And on what basis does he arrive at this suspicion, when I attest so many times to my belief? Because I translated 'sacrament' as 'mystery'? What a great weapon to convict a man of heresy!

But if this weapon is not effective enough, he has another, more effective one. Some nonsense written in German about 'comrades' has appeared with a piece of Erasmus' writings and his picture (indeed, twice).[39] As if I could control what this or that man raves about, especially when I keep far away from the Lutherans. I have not yet seen the booklet and do not know who authored it. Nor is this the only book that circulated then, for everything is full of this kind of inept nonsense. Those who brought out these lies show their exceptional stupidity if they wanted by these means to lure me into their camp, whereas nothing will alienate me more.

* * * * *

38 Erasmus means Zúñiga's backers or organizers. Aediles were officials in ancient Rome, in charge of organizing public games and plays.

39 The reference is to Johann Eberlin, *Die xv Bundtsgenossen* (The Fifteen Comrades, Basel 1521), in which sections of the *Praise of Folly* are quoted in a loose German translation, two of them headed by woodcut portraits of Erasmus. For the identification and description of the book, see Allen Ep 1481:27 note. Erasmus used the word *conjurati* to translate 'Bundtsgenossen.' The Latin word can mean either 'confederates' or 'conspirators.' The German word has no pejorative meaning.

I am not in league with Luther, not even with a Lutheran fly;[40] rather I was the first of all to discourage both Luther himself and his friends from this dangerous enterprise, guessing even then the outcome we see now, although I never believed that things would come to this pass. I have drawn people away from Luther's party as much as I can, although he appeared at first to wage a battle for evangelical liberty in most of his books, and had undertaken a sacred cause, pleasing to the world, if he had waged it the way most people expected of him. It appears it was also their plan to involve the lovers of languages and good literature in this [Luther] business.[41] And yet I was linked in friendship with them before the world knew the name of Luther. I would rather swear off friendship, the sweetest and dearest of possessions, than seem in any way divisive. I have always kept the cause of languages and good literature separate from the business of Luther. Indeed, I have always kept the business of the evangelical doctrine separate from the business of Luther. For the gospel truth and the apostolic tenets must not in any way command less authority on account of Luther's wrong teaching.

Furthermore, I cannot help it if someone takes something from my books; after all the old heretics took the seeds of their errors from the gospels and the epistles of the apostles. If Luther took anything out of my books, which are correct, I should not be blamed. If he corrupts something I said in moderate terms for the sake of admonition, I cannot be blamed any more than a physician, when someone mixes his healing drug with poison. For the sake of admonition, we are often carried to extremes, so that we seem to go too far in some places. If someone considers the business as a whole, there is no cause to reproach me. If you take hold of a man standing at the edge,[42] you may easily drag him over the edge into the abyss. Here is an example: Seeing Christian princes on both sides causing turmoil for so many years

* * * * *

40 The expression 'not even with a fly' is proverbial (*Adagia* II i 84).

41 See, for example, Ep 1161 of 1520, in which Ulrich von Hutten urges the expedience of humanists and reformers working hand in hand. He pleaded with Erasmus not to stand in the way of Luther and the Reformation, because if it succeeded, 'liberal studies too will flourish and the humanities will be held in honour' (Ep 1161:46–7). Erasmus by contrast discouraged 'including under one label things by nature quite distinct' and was afraid that the perceived connection between the two movements would give scholastic theologians a handle to suppress both. When Luther's works appeared, they saw their chance, he said. 'Here was a weapon put in their hands, with which they could finish off language studies and the humanities' (Ep 1167:90–1, 106–7).

42 Proverbial (*Adagia* IV v 46)

now with frequent wars, I cry out against war in many passages, as forcefully as I can, but nowhere do I declare that no war between Christians can be legitimate. Yet I find it difficult to allow any war between the sons of peace.[43] Luther perhaps categorically condemns all wars. I do not approve of those who attack the Turks for the sake of booty alone and make no attempt to use Christian arguments to draw them to the evangelical faith, but merely use force. Luther, as I hear, says that those who resist the Turks, resist God.[44] I do not approve of the superstition of many people who make vulgar vows, such as a man vowing for a paltry reason to visit Jerusalem, when he has a young wife at home, and little children for whom he ought to care according to Paul's precept.[45] For if he neglects them, he is worse than an infidel. Luther perhaps condemns all such vows, which I certainly value much less than the common people do. That, I suppose, is a 'parallel.'[46] But in this fashion I could produce six hundred such parallels out of Jerome, Bernard, Chrysostom, and even a few out of Thomas.[47]

Finally Zúñiga prescribes the following laws for me (you would think they are precious): If I wish to be seen as 'orthodox, I must argue as diligently as possible against the whole of the Lutheran heresy in my published books'; otherwise I will be proclaimed a Lutheran 'at all the crossroads of Rome, where Zúñiga is writing this down' – how wonderful that Zúñiga writes this in Rome, as if everything that is done in Rome is noble, and as if he was the only madman in Rome. Yes, Zúñiga is writing in Rome, but not by the grace of the Cardinals, who forbade the printing of his books, which are sycophantic, seditious, and unworthy of that city, and who forbade their sale after they

* * * * *

43 'If the son of peace is there, your peace will rest upon him' (Luke 10:6).

44 In his *Resolutions* Luther wrote that those who intend to wage war against the Turks, 'will wage war against God, who says he will punish our iniquities with that lash' (WA 1 535).

45 1 Tim 5:8

46 Zúñiga had quoted a passage from Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*: 'He leaves wife and children at home, and goes off to Jerusalem or Rome or St James's shrine, where he has no call to be' (CWE 27 122). For similar complaints of Erasmus about being misrepresented see Ep 1202:237–52. His enemies were holding forth, he said, 'on the points of agreement between me and Luther … Somewhere maybe I point out that vows should not be undertaken unadvisedly, nor do I approve of those who leave at home the wife and children whose life and morals are their first concern, and go running off to Santiago or Jerusalem where they have no business …. Luther they say, entirely condemns all vows.'

47 That is, out of the Church Fathers and scholastic theologians

had furtively been printed.[48] And they are ridiculed by all learned men. That is how Zúñiga writes in Rome. If he goes on raving like that, he runs the risk of being driven out of the city with fisticuffs. For the Roman See will not tolerate such a boorish and malicious patron whose stupidity harms the cause they wish to promote.

But once again observe Zúñiga's prudence. He calls on me, an obscure little grammarian suddenly turned *theologaster*,[49] whom one could truly call the most inexperienced man (although that evaluation should have come more suitably from someone else!) to take on a subject that requires a consummate theologian, a man very unlike Zúñiga. If Zúñiga believes that I can accomplish the task he imposes on me, how can he have the nerve to deny that I have any experience in theology? If I am incapable, the man who commits this task to me is stupid. But whatever I shall do in this matter, I will not do it on the authority of Zúñiga. So far, I have stated in my letters, books, and conversations that I was, am, and absolutely will be keeping my distance from the Lutheran faction.[50] That is, I think, more than Zúñiga does, even if he calls Luther a 'heretic' six hundred times, since many people are in doubt whether he who uses this label may deserve it himself. For no one ever called Plato or Philo a heretic.[51]

If that pious man detests the impious Luther so much, why does he not inveigh against his teaching with 'oars and sails,' as they say,[52] with all languages and disciplines, since he is perfectly skilled and experienced in all of them, and finally with his rare eloquence? No, he prefers to quarrel with Erasmus, to satisfy his aediles,[53] and to teach correct speech through malicious speech. He might apply his efforts to Hebrew studies, with which

* * * * *

48 See below, p 314.

49 For this pejorative use of 'theologian' see also above, p 291. In his *Precursor* Zúñiga had referred to Erasmus as 'a lowly grammarian suddenly turned *theologaster*' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge ASD IX-8 203).

50 He had emphasized this already in letters of 1519 (Epp 1033:210–22, 1041:50).

51 An ironic reference to a garbled passage in Zúñiga: 'Erasmus and Luther are so perfectly in agreement that one could rightly say about each of them what was said in antiquity about Plato and Philo, "either Erasmus lutheranizes, or Luther erasmianizes"' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge ASD IX-8 203). As it stands, Zúñiga's statement is nonsensical. He meant to allude to the proverbial saying 'Either Plato philonizes, or Philo platonizes' (*Adagia* II vii 71).

52 That is, making every effort

53 See n38 above.

he has been familiar from a tender age,[54] and provide a useful service to scholarship. But fighting Erasmus is more important to him than defending his poorly received annotations.

Lutherans very clearly interpret my writings as attacks on Luther and (I hear) are preparing to take their revenge on me.[55] I have explained to those to whom I owe an explanation why I have done nothing more so far.[56] I shall offer no other reason to Zúñiga than that I have little inclination to write against Luther, lest I become entangled with people like him, who dealt with the business of faith so stupidly that no enemy could have harmed it more. The leaders of the church have now largely realized the truth of this, and I fear that they will come to feel it even more clearly.

I have regretted more than once that I ever responded to Zúñiga even briefly.[57] I believe that I have already provided more than enough material for the fantasies of people, which arise from any calumny among the inexperienced. Zúñiga is no longer unknown to scholars. People are sufficiently cognizant of the sum of my faith. So far I have shown the most loyal respect to the Roman See and will continue to do so, even against Zúñiga's will. For

* * * * *

54 In his *Annotationes contra Erasmum* of 1520, Zúñiga had bragged that he, if anyone, could pass judgment on the disputed passages because he 'had spent not a few years studying the Old and New Testaments in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin' (quoted by Henk Jan de Jonge, ASD IX-2 15 n67).

55 See the warning Erasmus received from Willibald Pirckheimer in March 1522, Ep 1265:12–19: 'I know how much they disapprove of your recognition of free will and, had your friends not prevented it, you would long ago have been reading their attacks upon you … But they are more irritated by the way in which you presume to pick holes in what Luther writes – or so they say.'

56 Erasmus writes at length about his quandary in a letter to Pierre Barbier (d 1552), secretary to Pope Adrian VI: 'You will say, "Hitherto you have not written a word against Luther." For my not doing so there have been two principal reasons, lack of leisure and the consciousness of my own ignorance … I saw feelings run so high in both parties that one side could not be satisfied by anything less than roaring at the top of its voice, while the other was so well furnished both with manpower and with two-edged pamphlets that I would rather be exposed to the lances of the Swiss than cut to pieces by their sharp-pointed pens … On our side I am most falsely maligned as Luther's man; in Germany I am abused as an opponent of his faction' (Ep 1225:259–341).

57 Erasmus emphasized this repeatedly in his letters, for example to Paolo Bombace, the papal librarian, Ep 1236:64–6 ('I have published a laconic defence in reply [to Zúñiga], an undertaking which I already regret') and in a letter to Barbier (see preceding note), Ep 1294:5 ('I am sorry that I ever thought [Zúñiga] worth an answer').

in my opinion the man who wishes the best for the Roman See wishes it to be a worthy vicar of Christ and to excel the other churches not only in its title and authority, but also in the qualities of its leader. Let Zúñiga see for himself how purely and faithfully he respects the church, when he admits that he is hunting for benefices in Rome.[58] He has praised the wonderful godliness of that city and says that he has never seen more godly monks. If you don't want to be ungrateful, Rome, give Zúñiga some benefices for his paltry praise! He has called Luther an impious 'heretic' once or twice – give him a provostship! As if that couldn't be done by any rascal. Let Zúñiga attack Luther with scriptural evidence, let him refute Luther with solid arguments – then he can boast of being a theologian, even without white fur.[59] A man who finds it so easy to corrupt even what is well said should have no difficulty refuting what Luther said badly.

Now, if I am not orthodox in the eyes of Zúñiga, unless I attack Luther in huge and elaborate books, then Zúñiga is no Christian in my eyes, unless he has written most accurate commentaries on the epistle to the Hebrews. That would be better for him than me doing what he commands me to do, since I do not have enough time even to read Luther's numerous writings; and even if I had time, he writes many books in his own Saxon language, which I would read in vain, even if I could read them. There is no lack of people who write against Luther, if this evil can be put to rest by books, and they are much better equipped for such a fight than I am. In this matter, I will first satisfy Christ and my conscience, and only in the second instance all good and honest people. I do not accept Zúñiga's rules. I have other things to do that will be more beneficial, I believe, for Christianity.

And now farewell to Zúñiga's blasphemies, impieties, insanities, bold assertions, poisons, snakes, Lutheranisms, forerunners, accusations and counter-accusations, parallels and corruptions, Arians, Apollinarians, Patripassians,[60] which I shall neither deign to read, and which make me neither a better nor a more learned man! And I have no fear that there is a prince or pope or cardinal or bishop or theologian worthy of that title, who will bear with this

* * * * *

58 The source of this rather malicious assertion is unknown. If Zúñiga had in fact come to Rome in the hope of obtaining a benefice, he did not succeed in his quest.

59 See n10 above.

60 For the Arian and Apollinarian sects, see pp 7 nn22–3, 70, and 72 above. The Patripassians were a third-century sect who held the unorthodox belief that in the suffering of Christ God the Father suffered as well. See also above, *Apologia ad Caranzam* n104.

boorish and impudent pettifogger, who has introduced a new fashion in Rome – to gratify two or three monks[61] by raving in libellous books against the reputation of a man of whom no one had spoken ill before. And this is the man who respects the Roman See with sincere loyalty, disregarding Leo's admonition, disdaining the edict of the Cardinals,[62] obliging his stage managers and heeding his own wishes. I for one wish the Roman See better patrons! Farewell, reader.

The end of the apologia against Zúñiga's *Precursor*.

Basel, the printing press of Johann Froben, 6 August 1524

* * * * *

61 Erasmus believed that Zúñiga acted on the instigation of others. See n38 above.

62 See n46 above.

APOLOGIA AGAINST ZÚÑIGA'S 'CONCLUSIONS'

Apologia ad Stunicae Conclusiones

translated by
DOUGLAS H. SHANTZ

annotated by
ERIKA RUMMEL

(ASD IX-8 253–290; LB IX 381–392)

APOLOGIA AGAINST ZÚÑIGA'S 'CONCLUSIONS'

PARTICULARLY DANGEROUS AND OFFENSIVE CONCLUSIONS FOUND IN THE WORKS OF ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM, GATHERED BY DIEGO LOPEZ ZÚÑIGA[1]

Diego López Zúñiga to the pious Reader, greetings.

Although I have revealed Erasmus of Rotterdam's blasphemies and impieties, of which there are very many, in a short book published last year in this august city,[2] we wished to present his blasphemies in the form of statements in the scholastic manner,[3] for some people are taken in by the man's excessive verbosity and bombastic style, so that they do not sufficiently understand where the poison lurks in his chapters; thus the hearts of simple readers could very easily be infected. However, anyone even moderately knowledgeable about ecclesiastical matters can very easily understand Erasmus' meaning after having read our book. At the same time, our diligent effort will make clear to the whole world that Erasmus' statements differ in no way from the heretical and condemned statements of Luther. Even clearer proof of this will be offered in the three volumes[4] which we have written against

* * * * *

1 This is the title of the work published by Zúñiga (Rome 1523). Erasmus reprinted this title as well as Zúñiga's letter to the Reader, and his so-called conclusions in full in the edition of his response, *Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones* (*Apologia against Zúñiga's conclusions*, Basel: March 1524), which begins below on p 310.

2 That is, Zúñiga's *Erasmi Roterodami Blasphemiae et impietates nunc primum propalatae ac proprio volumine alias redargutae* (*Erasmus of Rotterdam's Blasphemies and impieties now first proffered and refuted in its proper volume elsewhere,* Rome 1522). The title foreshadows his intention to publish a full-length reply. See n4 below.

3 Scholastic theologians habitually posted lists of propositions or theses for debate (Luther's 95 Theses is a famous example). Zúñiga's list of statements (termed 'conclusions'), however, is not his own; the statements are passages drawn from Erasmus' works which Zúñiga found offensive.

4 A reference to the full-length 'Blasphemies and Impieties.' They remained in manuscript, however, because Zúñiga was unable to obtain permission from Pope Leo X to publish the book. The manuscript is now in Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo Principale VII B 41, folios 1–119.

all of his blasphemies and impieties and equally in our antapologia[5] against the same Erasmus. With God's guidance, we shall soon publish all of this. In the meantime, farewell, Reader, and when you have read this, be sure to use special caution in reading Erasmus' writings, which are very suspect and for the most part diverging from sound doctrine.

I Concerning the primacy of the Apostle Peter and of the apostolic see

1.[6] No one should put Peter first among all the apostles simply because Matthew puts him first[7] in the list of the apostles.

2.[8] Those words of our Saviour which are contained in Matthew chapter 16,[9] 'And I say to you, that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church,' refer not only to the Roman pontiff, but to him as the head of the church and along with him to the whole Christian people.

3. Among the ancients the Roman pontiff was not designated supreme, but merely Roman.[10]

4. Erasmus says that in the age of St Jerome they were not accustomed to expel anyone from communion (which they now call 'excommunicate,' using a novel term), unless the person belonged to that church. These words prove sufficiently that Erasmus believes that the Roman pontiff in those times did not have the right of excommunicating anyone except his own particular parishioners.[11] This is even more obvious from that heretical and insane conclusion of his which follows, when he infers:

5. For this monarchy of the Roman pontiff arose after the age of Jerome.[12]

* * * * *

5 Presumably a reference to *Libellus trium illorum voluminum praecursor quibus Erasmicas impietates ac blasphemias redarguit* (*A Short Precursor to those Three Volumes in which He Argues Against Erasmus' Impieties and Blasphemies,* Rome 1522), which is an antapologia to Erasmus' *Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi* (*Apologia against Zúñiga's Short Book Entitled 'Erasmus' Blasphemies and Impieties,'* Basel 1522).

6 The numbering of these points is Erasmus' arrangement. It does not occur in Zúñiga's own edition of the *Conclusions.* Number 1 is a quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Matt 10:2 ASD VI-5 185–6.

7 Matt 10:2–4

8 A paraphrase of Erasmus' annotation on Matt 16:18 ASD VI-5 248

9 Matt 16:18

10 Quoting Erasmus' scholia on Ps Jerome, *Epistola ad Innocentium de muliere septies percussa*; Erasmus omitted this phrase in his edition of 1524.

11 Paraphrasing Erasmus' *censura* on Jerome, *Epistola ad Damasum*

12 A literal quotation from the same *censura*; see preceding note.

6. Christ's words to Peter, 'You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven,'[13] pertain to the universal body of the Christian people.[14]

7. Whether Damasus was supreme pontiff of the world, I leave undecided.[15]

8. Erasmus says[16] that Augustine did not recognize the degree of authority in the Roman see which we now grant to it.

II Concerning the Sacrament of Confession

9. Erasmus says:[17] In former times there was some confession of having led a bad life, but I believe it was an open confession, nor do we read that it was demanded from anyone.

10. Secret confession, as now practised and spoken in the priest's ear, appears to have been born of private consultations which are customarily done with bishops if any scruple bothers the conscience of a parishioner.[18]

11. Erasmus says that at one time confession was public, and there was public satisfaction for the sins committed.[19]

12. It appears that in the time of Jerome the secret confession of sins had not yet been instituted.[20]

III Concerning the Sacrament of Extreme Unction

13. Today those who suffer are anointed with holy oil, not so they might recover, but so that they might pass on more safely.[21]

* * * * *

13 Matt 16:18–19
14 A paraphrase of a passage in Erasmus' *scholion* on Jerome, *Epistola ad Marcellam contra Montanum*
15 Quoting Ep 843:563–6; Damasus was bishop of Rome (366–84 AD) when he charged Jerome with the revision of the New Testament.
16 The following is not a quotation of Erasmus' words, but a conclusion drawn from his *annotatiunculae* [short notes] on Cyprian's *Epistolae*, which he edited, Basel 1540.
17 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Acts 19:18 ASD VI-6 297
18 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Acts 19:18 ASD VI-6 298
19 That is, public penance; this is a quotation from Erasmus' comments on Jerome, *Epistola ad Oceanum de Fabiolae epitaphio*.
20 A quotation from Erasmus' comments ibidem
21 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Mark 6:13 ASD VI-5 389

IV Concerning the Sacrament of Marriage

14. Erasmus says[22] that the condition of marriage is more convenient for Jews than for us.

15. I am by no means sure whether this seventh sacrament (that is, marriage) was known to the ancients.[23]

16. There is no text from which it is clear that Greeks and Latins reckon marriage among the seven sacraments.[24]

17. I am by no means sure that the church in the age of St Jerome would have considered matrimony among the sacraments.[25]

18. The theologians make matrimony one of the seven sacraments.[26]

V Concerning canonical hours

19. Erasmus says[27] that priests are burdened with excessively long-winded prayers, and with compulsory prayers, and sometimes with inept and ridiculous, not to say impious, tasks.

VI Concerning ceremonies

20. Today we differ from the Jews in the rationale rather than the number of ceremonies; yet for that reason Christ cut them down in the course of time.[28]

21. Christians are burdened with more ceremonies than Jews.[29]

22. I do not approve that almost the whole life of Christians is, through human regulations, weighed down with ceremonies.[30]

* * * * *

22 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Matt 11:30 ASD VI-5 209
23 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on 1 Cor 7:39 ASD VI-8 176
24 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation ibidem
25 A quotation from Erasmus' notes added to Jerome's *Epistola ad Geruntiam de monogamia*
26 A quotation from Erasmus' notes on Jerome's *Epistola ad Eustochium de virginitate servanda* CWE 61 193
27 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Matt 6:7 ASD VI-5 153–4
28 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Acts 21:39 ASD VI-6 312
29 A quotation from Erasmus' note added to Jerome's *Epistola ad Algasiam*
30 A quotation from Erasmus' *Ratio* or *System of True Theology* CWE 41 618

VII Matters referred to under various headings

23. Erasmus says[31] that the Christian teaching of our day is encumbered, confused, and obscured, partly by mingling in human laws and disciplines, partly by the dreams and trifling inventions of ambitious men.

24. Nowhere does one read expressly the words with which Christ consecrated the Supper.[32]

25. I do not reproach the practice of certain people who truly live by begging, but I think they would do better – if they are healthy as very many of them are – if they provided for themselves with their own hands, whence they could both support themselves and other, needy people.[33]

26. Erasmus says[34] that the designation 'servant' is not suited to Christ.

27. Erasmus says[35] that Christ obeyed the Father as a son, and was not subjected to him as a servant.

28. The apostles learned their Greek from everyday conversation.[36]

29. In the business of this world, it is perhaps not truly Christian to take an oath for the sake of estates or money.[37]

30. Just as heretics used to alter some things in the sacred writings in order to safeguard their own error, so it is apparent in some places that some words have been added by the orthodox in order to exclude or refute the errors of the heretics.[38]

31. Erasmus says[39] that the miracles of St Jerome, recorded by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, are mere fables.

32. It appears to have been Christ's intention universally that Christians should surpass others in tolerance, not in arms.[40]

34.[41] In Jerusalem all the relics of Christianity either have been completely obliterated or can be shown to be false and doubtful.[42]

* * * * *

31 Paraphrasing Erasmus' annotation on Matt 11:30 ASD VI-5 208
32 A quotation (with changed word order) of Erasmus' annotation on Mark 14:24 ASD VI-5 424
33 A quotation of Erasmus' annotation on Luke 2:12 ASD VI-5 476
34 A short version of Erasmus' annotation on Acts 4:27; see ASD VI-6 216–18.
35 An abridged version of Erasmus' words in the annotation ibidem
36 Paraphrasing Erasmus' annotation on Acts 10:38; see ASD VI-6 250.
37 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on 1 Cor 15:31 ASD VI-8 294
38 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on 1 Tim 1:17, deleted in the second edition of 1519; see ASD VI-10 40.
39 Paraphrasing Erasmus' *censura* on Ps Cyril, *Epistola de miraculis* PL 22 289–326
40 A quotation from the notes added to Jerome's *Epistola ad Geruntiam*
41 Although Erasmus skips 33 by mistake, he does not omit any text in Zúñiga's (unnumbered) conclusions.
42 A quotation from Erasmus' scholia on Jerome's *Epistola ad Paulinum*

35. Today the fancies of monks and, yes, even the nonsense of mere women are read alongside the sacred Scriptures.[43]

36. Those who day after day mumble their way through Psalms they do not understand, are not meditating upon the Lord's law but 'beating the air.'[44]

37. The flock of those for whom Christ died is not entrusted to anyone except to one who eagerly loves Christ.[45]

38. Erasmus says[46] that the creed produced at the council of Nicaea is the one which is commonly called 'apostolic.'

39. Erasmus says[47] that the story of the flaying of St Bartholomew is implausible.

40. I have no patience with those who say that sexual excitement is shameful and that venereal stimuli have their origin, not in nature, but in sin.[48]

41. Today we see among Christians more superstition in the choice of foods than there ever was among the Jews.[49]

42. The whole life of Christians abounds everywhere in folly, which priests readily permit and even support, not unaware of the great profit which usually accrues from them.[50]

There are further, innumerable conclusions of the same kind which can be extracted from the meaning of Erasmus' words, from which it is abundantly clear that Erasmus does not judge rightly concerning the primacy of the apostolic see, concerning the sacraments and the ecclesiastical teachings and instructions, but rather that he agrees in all these things and in every way with that heretic Luther, as can be deduced with sufficient clarity from my book about his blasphemies and impieties,[51] once it is published.

Rome, 1523

* * * * *

43 A quotation from Erasmus' scholia on Jerome's *De viris illustribus*; in the edition of 1524 Erasmus changed 'monks' to 'anyone.'
44 A quotation from Erasmus' commentary on Ps 1:2 CWE 63, 31; *Adagia* I vi 50
45 Paraphrasing Erasmus' *System of True Theology* CWE 41 526
46 Paraphrasing Erasmus' *System of True Theology* CWE 41 551; the council of Nicaea took place in 325 AD.
47 Paraphrasing Erasmus' *System of True Theology* CWE 41 682
48 A quotation from Erasmus' *Encomium matrimonii*, embedded in his letter-writing manual as an example of a hortative letter (CWE 25 136)
49 A quotation from Erasmus' annotation on Rom 14:1 CWE 56 366
50 A loose quotation of Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 115
51 See n4 above.

ERASMUS' REFUTATION OF STUNICA'S INDIVIDUAL CONCLUSIONS

DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OFFERS GREETINGS TO THE MOST DISTINGUISHED JOHANNES FABRI,[52] CANON OF CONSTANCE, AND COUNSELLOR TO THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCE FERDINAND

Your servant has delivered to me the suspicions of Zúñiga, which he calls *Conclusions*. I see happening to me exactly what they say happened to Hercules.[53] While I contend here with the Hydra, a crab has crept up from another place. And besides, in the beginning I suspected that this 'drama' was produced by a Lutheran somewhere.[54] For that man has many very foolish friends who delight in such things since they are not able to injure me any further. But as soon as the composition and letters sent from Rome had informed me that this game was entirely Zúñiga's, I deliberated a long time whether he should be answered, especially since I had answered his blasphemies a long time ago.[55] Finally, when I saw that his book was widely distributed among the people, I devoted a day's work to the matter lest guileless Christians be deceived by the man's foolish talk. I believe Cardinal Campeggi is now in your part of the world;[56] if only that man of God would settle this discord as we would wish. Farewell. Basel, March 1, 1524.

* * * * *

52 This letter is Ep 1428. It is addressed to Johannes Fabri (1478–1541), suffragan bishop of Constance from 1521 and councillor to Archduke Ferdinand of Austria from 1523. Like Erasmus, Fabri had initially been open to the ideas of the reformers but became increasingly critical of the movement.

53 See *Adagia* I v 39 'Not even Hercules can take on two,' referring to the myth that Hercules was attacked by a large crab, as he was struggling with the monster Hydra.

54 See Ep 1415:23–6: 'I suspect they are the work of some supporter of Luther who wanted either to drag me irretrievably into his party or have his revenge on me, for they … think me solely to blame for their lack of complete success.'

55 See n5 above.

56 Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggi (1474–1539), papal legate, sent to Germany by Pope Clement VII to represent Catholic interests at the Diet of Nuremberg; he left Rome on 1 February, reaching Nuremberg on 14 March.

Against Zúñiga's Preface

1. He calls three words plucked from my *Annotations* 'conclusions,' in which I define nothing, but rather offer the reader material for reflection occasioned by a text, and these come from books published before the name of Luther was known. 'Conclusions,' by contrast, make a definite statement.

2. Moreover, how is it that he does not perform his task sincerely? Clever man that he is, he omits those things which explain what I might mean.

3. Indeed, he does not even indicate the passage cited lest the reader, having examined it, should discover Zúñiga's malicious misrepresentation.

4. Indeed, he attributes to me what I set forth in the name of Origen, Augustine or another author.

5. Sometimes also he changes certain words for his own convenience, so that the matter might be more hateful.

6. When I say, 'it seems' or 'it appears,' no doubt thinking that this seems apparent from the passage which I am treating or appears so to certain people, he takes it in such a way as if I had simply said, 'I think.'[57]

7. He conceals the fact that he collected these things from books which I had published before the world had heard the name of Luther, nor did anyone suspect that the man was about to appear. Certainly I have never read the books of the Hussites or the Wycliffites.[58]

8. And I have myself corrected in later editions [of the New Testament] many things which some people seized on to accuse me falsely, since I wished to avoid all scandal. For the *Novum Testamentum* with annotations has now been published in a third edition, with a fourth edition in preparation for some time now.[59] Likewise the edition of Jerome.[60] Zúñiga has made his selection mainly from these works.

9. Although I responded clearly to these and many other things in the book published more than a year ago,[61] he acts as if I had never answered him.

* * * * *

57 The Latin *videtur* can mean either 'it seems, it has the appearance' or 'it seems right' in the sense of 'it is my opinion, I think that …'

58 Zúñiga does not mention Hussites or Wycliffites in his *Conclusions*, but he did so in the earlier *Erasmi Blasphemiae et impietates*. Jan Hus (1369–1415) and John Wycliffe (1330–87) were dissidents and forerunners of the Reformation.

59 The third edition of the New Testament appeared in 1522; the fourth in 1527.

60 The edition of Jerome's works was first published by Froben, Basel 1516; a revised edition appeared 1524–6 (see Ep 1465).

61 See n5 above.

10. He gathers together certain statements which he distorts by interpreting them wrongly, whereas he could know what I was thinking from other passages. In this fashion I could cite two hundred statements from the Pauline epistles, more suspect and scandalous than the passages which Zúñiga collects, if I wished to interpret them in the manner he does.

11. Neither the pontiff nor the emperor wanted a hateful investigation to be conducted into books that had been written before the business of Luther arose. Or else, one would have to inquire into the books of Thomas and Bonaventure and Peter Lombard,[62] perhaps with more justification than into mine.

12. I have not made any attacks on Leo's bull or against the edict of the emperor;[63] rather I have behaved in this business – even before the edicts of rulers – in such a way as befitted an orthodox believer and one who would be obedient to the leaders of the church.

13. Although Zúñiga produces not even one statement which links me with Luther, he nevertheless shamelessly concludes that I agree in all things and in every way with Luther, a man whom he so often calls heretical. O learned and brave theologian! I am amazed that he is not wearing a mitre decorated with bells.[64] However, it would have been braver to contend with the books of Luther and the Lutherans, who with great licence rant and rave against the name of the Roman pontiff.

Physicians declare that consistency is a sure mark of a sound mind. Consistency is missing practically everywhere in the writings of Zúñiga. In his title he calls my statements 'suspect,' and a little later as if having forgotten himself, he calls the same passages 'principal blasphemies.' Can that which is merely suspect be called 'blasphemy'? Shortly afterwards he says that he will make this 'clearly shine forth in the whole world.' Where there is a clear light, there is no suspicion; rather, the truth is perceived.

Not being content with this, he adds that Erasmus' ideas differ in no respect from the heretical and damnable conclusions of Luther. Since Luther asserts his teachings plainly, and Zúñiga calls mine only suspect, how can he take the position that I differ in no respect from Luther?

* * * * *

62 The *Summa theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas (1225–74), the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard (1096–1160), and the commentary on the *Sententiae* of Bonaventure (1221–74) were standard textbooks used by scholastic theologians.

63 The papal bull 'Exsurge Domine' (1520) and the Edict of Worms (1521) against Luther

64 The traditional headgear of court jesters

Let him pretend that all these statements of mine agree with Luther – I will show that not even one agrees with him. And what impudence to conclude in closing that it is exceedingly plain from this that my statements agree with Luther in all things and in every way!

First, can it be that what is suspect is exceedingly plain?

Next, can it be that one who agrees in ten points agrees in all things? Or will Zúñiga prove the following conclusion: A person is suspected of having purchased ten pumpkins in Rome; it is therefore apparent in the most obvious way that he has bought up all the pumpkins in the whole of Italy.

Next, since there are numerous articles[65] listed in Leo's bull, among which not even a syllable is agreed upon between Luther and me; and since there are certain things in my books which are diametrically opposed to his teachings, which is well known from the complaints of Luther and his friends, as for example concerning free will[66] – how can Zúñiga proclaim boldly that there is agreement between me and Luther in everything and in every way?

I beseech you, reader, does Zúñiga think he is writing for men or for pumpkins?

Paul the apostle, when he heard Festus accusing him of insanity, answered: 'I am not insane, most excellent Festus, but I speak words of sobriety and truth.'[67] Zúñiga could not make use of this reply after asserting such blatant falsehoods that he might say with less impudence that an ass is a bird.[68] He is never consistent; his conclusion is such that one could make a better case for milking a he-goat. Thus everyone will understand that it is not without reason that he has a chain in his coat of arms.[69] Yet he wanders about in Rome, never afraid of the silent judgments of learned men, and enjoys glorying in his more than scurrilous abuse, and delights in people pointing him out and hearing them say 'This is the man who writes against Erasmus.'

* * * * *

65 There are 41 propositions listed in Leo's bull.

66 In 1524 Erasmus published the *Diatribe de libero arbitrio* (Discussion about Free Will) against Luther, who maintained that there was no free will. For the text of this drawn-out controversy, see CWE, volumes 76 and 77.

67 Acts 26:24–5

68 Proverbial (*Adagia* III vii 24)

69 Zúñiga's coat of arms, which appears on several of his publications, consists of a scutcheon with a chain around the border. Erasmus hints that he deserves to be chained up.

Again and again he brags that he has published the book of his *Blasphemies*[70] in the august city of Rome. For my part I would not permit Rome to be tainted with such disgrace in the eyes of those ignorant of what happened. Nor would I let anyone suspect that such inept nonsense is sold in Rome by the authority or the permission of its leaders.

Zúñiga first published his poisonous *Annotations on the New Testament*[71] in Spain and did so although all good and learned men were dissuading him,[72] since he had never been harmed by me and perhaps had been helped by my books. This was the first showing of his famous talent. Since this book was as displeasing to all as it was pleasing to the author himself and since it could not be sold in Spain, he brought it to Rome. There he was forbidden by Leo to publish anything that would hurt the reputation of Erasmus[73] and [told] if there was anything worthy of correction in my books, he should point it out with the modesty befitting learned men. He tried many avenues,[74] in vain.

In the meantime he had prepared the book of *Blasphemies*. After Leo died, he began to make this book public. For the people of Rome permit themselves every conceivable liberty in the interregnum between popes, to such a degree that many who kept valuables at home were compelled to employ armed force to drive away looters.[75]

For at such a time they think that God himself is dead. Zúñiga thought this was the right time and convenient for publishing his book. When the cardinals became aware of the matter, they issued an edict forbidding publication of such a book. Zúñiga remained inactive for fear of punishment. But still the book appeared with the help of certain monks. Its sale was prohibited by yet another edict of the cardinals. At the same time Carranza appeared on the scene.[76] Since Zúñiga would not put an end [to his activities],

* * * * *

70 See n2 above.

71 *Annotationes contra Erasmum Roterodamum in defensionem tralationis Novi Testamenti* (Annotations against Erasmus of Rotterdam in Defence of the New Testament Translation), Alcalá 1520

72 Cardinal Cisneros discouraged him from publishing it. See Juan Vergara's letter to Zúñiga, CWE 8 346.

73 See n4 above.

74 That is, to obtain permission to publish the book

75 Leo died on 1 December 1521. His successor, Adrian VI, was elected on 9 January 1522.

76 Sancho Carranza published a critique of Erasmus' edition of the New Testament: *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi Annotationes* (Rome 1522). For Erasmus' reply see pp 161–240 above.

he barely escaped being thrown into prison. And he would have been thrown into prison if he had not enjoyed the favour of certain people at the papal court.[77] For 'like lips like lettuce.'[78] Furthermore, what the foremost cardinals thought of the books, I can show on the basis of the honourable titles with which they adorned this author in letters to me.[79] When Adrian VI arrived in Rome,[80] Zúñiga began to take sedulous action to disseminate his books. Adrian openly forbade Zúñiga to make such attempts. After Adrian died,[81] Zúñiga returned to his old ways. And because there was not enough time to publish what he had written[82] during the days the cardinals sat in conclave to elect a new pontiff, Zúñiga issued his *Conclusiones*. And since he feared that they might not be sold before the matter became known to the cardinals, he hired boys who would normally go about Rome selling eggs, mushrooms, horoscopes, sheets with catchy tunes and similar nonsense, to force the *Conclusiones* of Zúñiga on an unwilling public. These things I have learned from letters sent to me by a good many scholars[83] and know with as much certainty as if I had been present in Rome myself.

And this man who so often in this manner dares to ridicule the edicts of the sacred court of cardinals and pontiffs, pretends that he does this on the official authority of the city of Rome. These books are produced in Rome, but by Zúñiga, and at a time when it was permitted because the worst people could do as they pleased in Rome. These books are written in that propitious city, but in that same city Pasquillus produces his little verses every year, stone statue that he is,[84] but he is somewhat less dull than Zúñiga. In this fair city the Jews lend at interest, the mimes perform in pantomime, the prophets make their predictions, salesmen of snake oil harangue the crowds – what is

* * * * *

77 Perhaps Cardinal Bernardino de Carvajal (1455–1522), theologian at the University of Salamanca and later an important diplomat at the papal courts. He was Dean of the college of cardinals at the time of his death. See Ep 1330 48–51.

78 *Adagia* I x 71, akin to 'birds of a feather'

79 'Honourable titles' is clearly ironic. Erasmus may refer to the reaction of Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggi (see above, note 56), to whom he complained about Zúñiga in Epp 1410, 1415, and 1422.

80 In August 1522

81 Adrian died on 14 September 1523.

82 That is, to publish the full version of the *Blasphemiae et impietates*; see n4 above.

83 For example, Ep 1260 from Jakob Ziegler (c 1470–1549), theologian and geographer who was employed at the papal court at that time.

84 A statue in Rome, where people deposited satirical verses; from 1509 these verses were published annually by the Roman printer Giacomo Mazzocchi.

there not available in this fair city? And in this city Zúñiga writes, but he does not just write. And on account of this I am by no means sure whether the city should be called 'propitious,' because it nourishes every kind of living creature, Zúñiga among them.

And this decent fellow dons the lion skin,[85] so that by his private authority he might pronounce on another's writings, going on and on blathering about heresies, blasphemies and impieties and insanities. Which faculty of theologians has ever condemned anything in my books?[86] Which bishop? Which pontiff? But Zúñiga, who is not even a theologian,[87] forcefully pronounces judgment, taking upon himself the office of censor without the approval of the people and the fathers [of the city].

If his book of *Blasphemies* was pleasing to the cardinals, why did they repeatedly forbid its sale? If it was displeasing, why does he repeatedly boast of it?

And observe how very clever the man is.

He obtained favour by offering neither excessive praise nor a sedulous defence. He praised the pontiff, the city, and especially the monks; it was shameful to be praised in this way. He began to fight with spear and shield[88] on behalf of the pontiff's dignity; he was ordered to cease.

Zúñiga does not consider what he is doing when he attempts to drag me over to Luther's side – though he will never succeed in this attempt. What can be more useless? For it would be better to draw me away than to propel me toward him. If Zúñiga desires to please the Lutherans by taking vengeance on me, on whom they wish evil, he does not act at all in the spirit of those who wish Luther ill.

He tries to persuade the world that there is agreement between me and Luther. The Lutherans would like that; and yet he does not persuade them.

Those who favour the pontiff's cause try to tear away whomever they can from Luther's fellowship. Zúñiga is eager to push men into Luther's camp. The pontiffs are concerned that heretics be turned into orthodox believers. Zúñiga tries to make heretics of the orthodox.

* * * * *

85 That is, playing the hero coming to the rescue; Hercules is depicted wearing a lion skin. See *Adagia* III v 98.

86 A few years later, however, the Faculty of Theology at Paris investigated and censured numerous passages in Erasmus' writings. For Erasmus' responses see the texts in CWE 82.

87 Zúñiga does not contradict Erasmus. In the absence of any proof, we may therefore assume that he had no doctorate in theology.

88 That is, fought an out and out battle (*Adagia* II viii 66)

With this preamble, I enter upon the *Conclusions*, which he begins with the subject of the primacy of the pontiff, trusting that in future he might arouse ill will in him toward me, and when this has been done, that I will be at greater risk in other matters. Therefore, he is more concerned about the primacy of the pontiff than about the sacraments of the church. You might say that here the character of the man is revealed.

I Concerning the Primacy of the Pontiff

1. 'No one should …' etc.[89] With these words I do not take anything away from the primacy of the Roman pontiff; rather, I show that one cannot argue conclusively on the basis of the list of names. Although Peter is everywhere[90] named in first place among the twelve, from which his pre-eminence may be inferred with probability, it is not consistently the order found in the manuscripts of the synoptic gospels; for there, Matthew comes first before the other Evangelists, but in his own Gospel his name comes later.

And in a certain passage[91] Peter is mentioned in a later place just as Barnabas is placed in one passage[92] before Paul, and Priscilla before her husband Aquila.[93] Nor is that always the case, so that one cannot base a cogent argument on it. And so I have not condemned the concept of primacy but rather the way it is argued. The text [of the lemma] is found in Matthew, chapter 10.

2. 'Those words,' etc.[94] Here, as I note, I am reviewing Origen's opinion[95] which appears to go against those who assign pre-eminence to the Roman Pontiff. But in that same passage I review Cyprian's opinion,[96] which favours the other side. I myself, meanwhile, refute or define nothing but merely provide material for thought to the reader.

3. 'The Roman Pontiff,' etc.[97] I do not recollect the source from which Zúñiga took this passage. Therefore I do not know on what occasion I wrote

* * * * *

89 See n7 above.
90 That is in Matt 10:2–4, Mark 3:16–19, Luke 6:14–16, and Acts 1:13
91 Gal 2:9
92 Eg Acts 11:30
93 Eg Acts 18:26
94 See n8 above.
95 Origen *Comm in Matt* GCS 10 84, where he explains that Christ founded his church not only on Peter but on all Christian believers, 'since our profession of faith is similar to his.'
96 Cyprian *Ep* 59 CCSL 3B 348: 'Peter on whom … the church was founded'
97 See n10 above.

it (yet that is of great importance). However, I suspect it is an excerpt from a certain letter in which I respond to some anonymous slanderer[98] who calls Damasus the supreme pontiff so that it would appear that Jerome was not allowed to change anything in his New Testament translation except by order of the supreme pontiff. I deprive him of that argument since the designation 'supreme pontiff' had not been heard of in that time, nor do I believe that this kind of universal authority was recognized then. Though even in former times a great deal of authority in matters of faith would have been granted to the see of Rome on account of the renown of the city and the pre-eminence of Peter as prince of the apostles, and finally because no heresy took its beginning in that see, whereas the faith wavered frequently in other places.

What I say is true: Damasus was not called 'supreme pontiff' but 'bishop of the city of Rome.'[99] Do I deny supremacy because at one time he was not called 'supreme'? At one time Christ was not called 'God'; was he therefore not God? But 'supreme' can express two meanings: someone who is of unparalleled excellence, or someone to whom all are subject. Thus, if someone should say that the king of France is supreme, he does not say that he is king of all kingdoms. And yet he could be called 'supreme' because there is no other king more excellent than he. Likewise, Christ is the supreme shepherd since all the churches are subject to him. We grant a similar pre-eminence to the Roman pontiff, his vicar, yet that was not always recognized in all churches, nor always exercised. I do not see why this view is suspect to Zúñiga.

4. 'In the age,' etc.[100] He chose this passage from some critical observation of mine in which I show that a certain letter is falsely attributed to Jerome. I do not dispute at that point what Damasus *could* have done, but what pontiffs were *accustomed* to do in that day. And therefore I wrote 'not accustomed,' I did not write 'not able.' Paul[101] indicates that he had a power which he was, however, unwilling to use. And in many cases Peter did not use the power which his successors exercised later. But if he did not exercise the power, it does not follow that he did not have the power. Therefore, I adduced the argument based on the custom of that time to show that the letter was fabricated by some writer in which, on account of an improper distribution

* * * * *

98 Erasmus means Edward Lee (see Ep 843:563–6), but the quotation comes from his scholia on Jerome. See n10 above.

99 See n15 above.

100 See n11 above.

101 1 Cor 9:4–12

of bread, Damasus is told to bring a general sentence of excommunication on all involved.

5. 'Whether this monarchy …' etc.[102] From this one passage he draws two heretical statements.[103] When I say 'this monarchy,' I understand all the attributes of power which Roman pontiffs were exercising at the time when I wrote those words. At that time the archbishop of Scotland was not permitted to wear the pallium unless obtained from the Roman pontiff.[104] I offer one example, when I could mention hundreds of this kind. But if someone is so shameless as to say that the Roman pontiff at the time of Jerome exercised that authority which Julius exercised in France and Italy, and that he did so throughout all Europe, Africa, and Asia – places to which the Christian religion had spread in Jerome's time – I will confess that I wrote this, not heretically, but at any rate rashly and incautiously. For there I do not speak of an authority that is passed down but one that is exercised. Who denies that great authority was passed down to pontiffs for the edification of the church, not for its destruction? But those who have this power do not always make use of it. And sometimes they usurp a power they do not have. Someone who is critical of power that has been usurped, or who says that it has not been used, does not automatically deny what has been passed down. But here I am thinking not about a monarchy that has been passed down but one that is exercised, as is clearly indicated by the words which precede the statement: *non solere* [not customarily]. Nor was it relevant to my argument what Damasus was able to do, but rather what he was accustomed to do.

Someone may say, the act of excommunication is mentioned there. True: I was thinking that a general anathema was not usually pronounced at that time, unless in the cause of the faith, and that by the pronouncement of a Synod. This pseudo-Jerome, relying on the authority of Chrysostom,[105] postulates that Damasus brought excommunication on all involved, on account of bread not having been distributed fairly. Now I do not dispute whether it was permitted to any pope to excommunicate for any reason, but I think that this was not generally done among the ancients. And this remark Zúñiga calls heretical and insane. Would you call that zeal for the pontiff's dignity?

* * * * *

102 See n12 above.
103 Zúñiga's statements 4 and 5 are drawn from the same source.
104 That is, from Pope Julius II (1503–13)
105 See Ps Jerome *Epistola ad Damasum* PL 30 302.

6. 'What is said to Peter,' etc.[106] I already responded to this in the second article. I do not see what Zúñiga suspects here unless perhaps that I think what they say Luther teaches, that all Christians are priests, that all can consecrate and absolve. But that idea never entered my mind, not even in a dream, when I wrote that passage.

7. 'Whether Damasus,' etc. This passage he plucked from a certain obscure letter from which he took his third suspicion.[107] A certain person acting against me[108] was calling Damasus 'supreme pontiff of the world.' I, leaving undecided whether he was supreme pontiff, say that this designation had not been heard of in those times. One who leaves something undecided neither approves nor disapproves; it does not always mean that he is in doubt, but rather that he is rushing on to other matters. But let Zúñiga assume that I had doubts. If there was any doubt, it concerned power being acknowledged or exercised, not being passed down. Even if I had any doubts concerning the manner in which the power had been passed down, it would have been nothing new since for a long time this has been a common theme at the universities, nor is there yet sufficient agreement about this matter among the theologians. But now, he will say, the bull of Leo has been proclaimed;[109] Cardinal Cajetan[110] was instructed in this matter. Yet the words in question were written by me seven years earlier.[111] And what danger would there be in writing the same things even now, referring to the manner in which power is being exercised?

8. 'Augustine,' etc.[112] A certain letter of Augustine exists in which he admonishes Innocent to beware of Pelagius.[113] In that epistle he apparently does not recognize the pre-eminence which they now attribute to the Roman pontiff. For he writes as if to a colleague. And Innocent expresses to him his thanks[114] for writing concerning a matter of faith to the bishop of that see. But if Augustine does not recognize papal primacy in that letter,

* * * * *

106 See n14 above.
107 See n15 above.
108 Edward Lee
109 The bull 'Exsurge Domine'; see n63 above.
110 Cardinal Tommaso de Vio Caietano (1469–1534), theologian and general of the Dominican order, was sent to Germany as papal legate to examine Luther's teachings.
111 Ep 843, from which Zúñiga extracted his quotation, was in fact dated 7 May 1518.
112 See n16 above.
113 Augustine to Innocent, bishop of Rome, 401–17 AD, *Ep* 177 PL 33 764–72
114 In *Ep* 181 PL 33 779–83

it does not follow that he does not recognize it in principle. Nor can we conclude: Augustine does not recognize Innocent's papal primacy, therefore Innocent did not have it. Someone who did not acknowledge the pope was not automatically a schismatic, since the pontiff himself did not require this acknowledgement. Greece did not acknowledge the Roman pontiff for a long time, and yet it was orthodox.[115] And there were probably in India people who would not even know that Peter was born, yet they were not schismatics. Likewise, Cyprian[116] calls Cornelius his brother and colleague – if someone would do so now, he would appear to acknowledge insufficiently the dignity of the Roman pontiff. But this same Cyprian in another place attributes much to Peter, whose successor is the Roman pontiff. And yet all these things, which Zúñiga records from my books, which had been produced before Luther was known, pertain to papal power as acknowledged or exercised.

So much for the suspicions of Zúñiga. If anyone compares what he proffers without context and in a hateful manner with his summary in the closing section – 'that Erasmus does not think rightly concerning the primacy of the apostolic see' – he will understand how insincere his reasoning is. He made two points in an earlier heading, saying that I do not think correctly 'concerning the primacy of Peter and the apostolic see,' whereas in his conclusion he combines them under the heading 'concerning the apostolic see.' What kind of books would Zúñiga have produced if he had been the accountant of some monarch, for example a Turk or a Sultan?

Now I do not respond to Zúñiga specifically, but am taking aim at the malice of our time and certain people's weakness. In his preface Zúñiga boasts of his own diligence. Therefore, we are to regard this man as entirely learned, vigilant, enlightened, untiring, and finally we are to assume that Zúñiga wished to teach, on the basis of many works I had written and published in more tranquil times, that I do not think correctly concerning the primacy of the pontiff. Why did he pass over the other passages in which I speak highly of the primacy of the pontiff? He noted an annotation made in passing, which he mentions in articles four and five. Why did he not note the passage in a certain letter to Damasus, on which I comment in my scholia in this manner:[117] 'Here Jerome seems totally convinced that all churches ought to be under the jurisdiction of the Roman See'?

* * * * *

115 The Eastern churches never formally acknowledged the primacy of the pope.
116 Cyprian *Ep* 55 CCSL 3B 256; Cornelius was bishop of Rome, 251–3 AD.
117 CWE 61 198

Eck[118] saw this passage, but not this passage alone. Zúñiga, by contrast, saw nothing except what he could criticize. And meanwhile he calls this the 'scholastic method.'[119] It is more like the method of spiders who creep up on everything, and turn into poison whatever they suck out. Why does he not refer to the many places in which I call the Roman pontiff truly supreme, the greatest in every way, the vicar of Christ the supreme shepherd, in which I grant to him supreme power next to God? People excessively in favour of Luther criticize me most for excessively praising the Roman pontiff. I prefer their reproach to that of being seditious.

Zúñiga may say, why did you comment on these things? I answer, why do you comment on my words rather than on what Occam wrote, not to mention Gerson and the others?[120] I was not concerned with the question of the primacy of the pontiff. Rather, turning to authors of old, I compared in passing the situation in our age with that in the age in which they had written, which is a large part of the benefit accruing from historical readings. With the same purpose in mind I read the Acts of the Apostles and compare them with later periods to learn what might have been added, what curtailed. And along the way if anything should come to mind, I note it in two or three words, affirming nothing. But who could have supposed that the Lutheran faction would arise, antagonistic toward the dignity of the pontiff, and that Zúñiga would be more noxious than they? Was I able to divine the tumults of this age, which I suppose even Luther himself never hoped for or feared?

Now, leaving aside Zúñiga for the moment, if someone should say to me, what do you think about the power of the Roman pontiff? I think very highly and faithfully concerning the power of the supreme pontiff – without doubt that pontiff is Jesus Christ the Lord of all; I have learned about this power from Him. For thus he says in the Gospel: 'All power is given to me in heaven and earth.'[121] From Paul I learned about Christ's glory; in some place he celebrates his majesty, but especially in the Epistle to the Philippians,

* * * * *

118 The theologian Johann Eck (1486–1543) criticized the passage in his *De primatu Petri adversus Ludderum* (On the primacy of Peter, against Luther, Paris 1521).

119 See n3 above.

120 William of Occam (c 1285–1347) and Jean Gerson (1363–1429) were eminent scholastic theologians, who wrote on the subject of papal primacy. Occam challenged the idea of the Pope's infallibility and asserted that a council could depose a heretical pope; similarly, Gerson advocated the idea that supreme authority rested with a general council. This point of view of Gerson and Occam is known as *conciliarism*.

121 Matt 28:18

chapter 2: 'For this reason God exalted him and gave him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of heaven, earth, and hell, and every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord to the glory of God the Father.'[122] If only the whole world would subject itself to this power! If only his glory could obscure all human glory! So that if someone wishes to glory, let him glory only in the Lord. And in the same way here Christ passed on great power to the ministers of the word of the Gospel. He himself while alive on earth accomplished the greatest things: 'And greater things,' he says, 'will they do than these.'[123] It was a great thing to heal the sick by the shadow of his body. It was a greater thing to grant the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands. His miracles, granted as the circumstances at the time required them, have ceased; likewise also the ceremonies of the Law. But the power of the Holy Spirit, which Christ imparted through the ministers of his sacraments, has not yet become outdated.

Therefore I do not condemn their authority, much less that of the Roman pontiffs. If some do their duty, I honour the Lord Jesus who through them is mindful for our salvation. If, however, they are not doing their duty, they are judges of me, not I of them. They have their own Lord and Judge before whom they stand or fall. I praise order, I love tranquillity, I hate strife. Such knowledge satisfies those who are insignificant and not particularly educated. But if only all the Roman pontiffs would exercise their authority with as much good will for Christ's glory and for the salvation of the Christian flock as I have in not disdaining their dignity!

Someone will say: what if they are plainly anti-Christs? I would do what Cardinal Cajetan suggests:[124] I will beseech God to bring help to his little sheep. Certainly I would not presume to raise a hand against the Lord's anointed. Nor would I ever betray him, knowing Christ's glory, nor have I betrayed him till now. There is no one more humble and worthless than Erasmus. I admit this, and yet I would not dare to say how I could have offended his dignity if I thought as badly about him as Zúñiga supposes. Now let Zúñiga, this vigilant man, go ahead and read through everything that Luther writes regarding the Roman Pontiff, for I would not dare to repeat it. Let him examine thoroughly everything that I attribute to him in so many of

* * * * *

122 Phil 2:9–11

123 John 14:12, which however reads 'will he do'

124 On Cajetan see n110 above. In his *De comparatione auctoritatis papae et concilii* (A Comparison between papal and conciliar authority, Cologne 1512), chapter 27, he suggested that prayer was the church's remedy against a bad pope.

my works, and then let him declare over and over, since he is so bold, that I agree with Luther in all things and in every way.

And yet Zúñiga suspects some great evil of me. What can you do with such a jealous man? If the law of Moses were still in force, it would be worthwhile to remedy suspicion with the remedies once used by wives to cure the jealousy of their husbands.[125] Or else there will be danger that as often I refer respectfully to the name of Jesus Christ, Zúñiga will suspect that I am thinking about Moses. Since long ago he revealed to the world these suspicions in the *Blasphemies* he published, it is amazing that a synod has not yet met, which would heal the suspicions of the man.

II Concerning the Sacrament of Confession

9. 'There was,' etc.[126] Since I add, 'as I believe,' 'as it appears,' I am asserting nothing here. And when I add, 'as practised now,' I mean confession with its circumstances today. But it is certain that some aspects of confession have been instituted by human beings, such as the time of confessing, and the different cases.[127] And yet while discussing some such topics with Lee[128] I show that I approve of this type of confession as if it had been instituted by Christ, and that I submit my opinion to the judgment of the church. But [someone might object], it is not lawful to have doubts. Concerning articles of faith, that is. In this case I believe it was lawful to doubt, at least before Leo issued his bull.[129] For I do not doubt whether we are obliged to confess, only whether this confession is a precept of Christ himself and whether it has been observed consistently since the time of the apostles.

10. 'Which has now been accepted,' etc.[130] This has been selected from the same passage and there is also a reply to this in the same work.[131]

* * * * *

125 See Num 5:11–31, where the elaborate ceremony is described.
126 See n17 above.
127 The Lateran Council of 1215 decided that every Christian had to go to confession at least once a year. Sins were divided into categories. In most cases, the parish priest could give absolution; in so-called 'reserved' cases, the sinner had to seek absolution from a higher authority, such as the local bishop or even the pope.
128 CWE 72 362–77
129 See n63 above.
130 See n18 above.
131 That is, in his response to Lee; see n98 above.

11. 'At one time,' etc.[132] Who would deny that this is true?[133] And yet this does not mean that I reject secret confession.

12. 'It appears,' etc.[134] I say, [confession was] 'instituted by men,' meaning as it is now practised, obligatory and subject to fines. I mean confession, in which sins are enumerated and the circumstances are explained. Because if secret confession was practised then, how could one bishop with a few priests have been able to satisfy so many people? However, I do not affirm this; I say that this appears to be so. Yet Gratian,[135] who first gathered various laws, made it a matter of choice whether we prefer to follow these practices or not. If confession had been instituted as it is now, that writer was not reasonable. And yet no one has attacked this passage in Gratian in so many generations. What could Zúñiga suspect here? That at one time I was undecided whether secret confession, such as is now required every year of all Christians, was instituted by Christ? That, according to my thinking, is not yet fully established. And yet I temper my opinion in faithful obedience, prepared to believe whatever the Catholic church believes. Let Zúñiga now go and see what Luther teaches concerning confession, and then declare that I agree with him in everything and in every way.

III Concerning Extreme Unction

13. 'Today,' etc.[136] What Zúñiga suspects here I cannot guess. Certainly I said nothing against the sacrament. The thought did not even enter my mind. I indicated the old usage and the new, just as I had indicated the ancient rite of baptism and compared it with the new.

IV Concerning Marriage

14. 'Of marriage,' etc.[137] What has this to do with our faith? Indeed the Jews had it easier with regulations concerning food and fasting than we have. What has this to do with Catholic faith? They were permitted to hate their enemies; we are not permitted. They were permitted to take several wives; we are not permitted. They were permitted to divorce a wife for any

* * * * *

132 See n19 above.
133 That is, that at one time 'confession was public.'
134 See n20 above.
135 Gratian in *De penitentia* (CJC 2.33.3) says that both forms of confession are acceptable, to God alone or to a priest. Gratian was a twelfth-century jurist who compiled an authoritative collection of canon laws.
136 See n21 above.
137 See n22 above.

trivial cause; we are not permitted to do so during our lifetime. They did not enter marriage without the intervening authority of parents or elders; with us there are often unions between boys and girls, between fools and drunks, prostitutes and impostors, with words in the future but with organs[138] in the present.[139] And yet this marriage is indissoluble. If Zúñiga approves of this, he rightly condemns my complaint. But he will say, 'The pontiff approves such marriages. Therefore, you reproach him.' I think that this kind of marriage does not please the pontiff. And would that he might declare marriage so contracted to be no marriage at all, just as he has declared a marriage invalid between a woman and an impotent partner.[140]

15. 'I am by no means sure,' etc.[141] Zúñiga ignores what I repeat so often in my writings, that when I refer to the sacrament without qualification, I mean sacrament according to the specific and exact term as it is defined [by the church]. In accordance with this, it is well known that for most Fathers marriage was not a sacrament. When Peter Lombard[142] writes that sacramental grace is not imparted through marriage, it follows that he denies that it is a sacrament. Durandus shows that the Fathers were in doubt about it, but that later theologians began to reckon it among the sacraments which have been properly accepted as such.[143] Yet I everywhere profess[144] that I place marriage among the sacraments in the strict sense of the term, and I did so

* * * * *

138 Henk Jan de Jonge (ASD IX-8 281) suggests that 'organs' refers to 'the documents of the marriage settlement,' but it is more likely that Erasmus meant physical organs. See *The institution of Christian matrimony* CWE 69 241: 'Words in the future tense, once physical union has taken place, are changed to the present tense.'

139 That is, the spoken promise 'I will marry you if' becomes a valid union through consummation. The legal formula probably goes back to Peter Lombard *Sententiae* 4 dist. 27 c 3.

140 Impotence was declared an impediment to marriage in 1234 in the *Decretals* of Gregory IX (CJC 2 704–8).

141 See n23 above.

142 Lombard, *Sententiae* (PL 192 842), says that some sacraments 'like baptism, offer a remedy for sin and confer grace in support; others only provide a remedy, like marriage.' Grace is usually seen as a defining element of a 'sacrament.'

143 Durandus of St Pourçain (c 1270–1334), scholastic theologian; in his commentary on Lombard he discusses several theologians and canonists who did not consider matrimony a sacrament. He adds, however, that 'modern theologians are practically unanimous in their opinion that grace is conferred through the sacrament of marriage.' He concludes that marriage must be accepted as a sacrament. For the full quotation see Henk Jan de Jonge in ASD IX-8 283. The *theologi recentiores* (later theologians) are the late medieval ones.

144 For example, in his *Praise of Marriage* CWE 25 131

before Luther was known. And concerning this matter I have responded at greater length first to Lee,[145] and later to Carranza.[146] On this point do I also agree in everything and in every way with Luther?

16. 'There is no,' etc.[147] Then let Zúñiga show according to the principle stated that sacramental grace is imparted by means of sacramental signs.

17. 'I am by no means sure,' etc.[148]

18. 'The theologians,' etc.[149] He repeats the same old song.[150] Yet not all theologians [consider marriage a sacrament];[151] only the more recent ones, as Durandus[152] says. And if it did not admit doubt, why was it necessary to define it at the Council of Florence,[153] with whose statement I was in agreement even before I knew that there was a decree? Even if the matter was still in doubt, I would be more disposed in favour of marriage. But if only this opinion was so well established in the world that all might honour marriage devoutly!

V Concerning canonical hours

19. 'Priests [are burdened with excessively long-winded prayers],' etc.[154] Since this is too plain to be denied, I wonder what Zúñiga wants. I do not impute this to the church or to the pontiff but to certain audacious and superstitious people who add whatever they wish, without authority. The pontiff does not immediately approve of things to which he shuts his eyes.

VI Concerning ceremonies

20. 'Today,' etc. In my books I show so often that I approve of the ceremonies established by the Fathers. On the other hand, who would not condemn the excessive and absurd ceremonies introduced by superstitious men? I do not condemn those who practice the ceremonies, but those who

* * * * *

145 CWE 72 296–303
146 In his apologia, pp 234–40 above
147 See n24 above.
148 See n25 above. No further counter-argument is offered here, presumably because Zúñiga was dwelling on the same point. See also the next article.
149 See n26 above.
150 Proverbial (*Adagia* II v 76)
151 Zúñiga had cited Erasmus' notes on Jerome's *Epistola ad Eustochium* mentioning 'theologians who consider matrimony one of the seven sacraments' (CWE 61 193).
152 See n143 above.
153 The Council of Florence (1439 AD) in the so-called 'Decretum pro Armenis' stated that matrimony was one of the seven sacraments.
154 See n26 above.

rely on them while neglecting the things which make one truly pious. And somewhere[155] I complain that ceremonies have increased and that piety has decreased. Formerly, how little ceremony there was in consecrating a bishop! The people prayed; the elders laid on their hands. Now consider that there is no end of ceremonies before a bishop is installed nowadays. And then compare the virtues of these bishops with those earlier ones. Let this be said for the sake of an example.

21. 'Christians [are burdened with more ceremonies than Jews],' etc.[156] Augustine[157] lamented this very thing in his day. What would he say were he alive now!

22. 'I do not approve,' etc.[158] Indeed I vehemently disapprove [of burdensome ceremonies]. I will give an example. Feast days are ceremonies: the bishops increase them daily for the slightest reason. Indeed, our guardians[159] and priors establish new ceremonies every day. In that passage I said nothing against the church or the pontiff. I condemn this inundation of ceremonies.

VII Various titles

23. 'The Christian teaching [is encumbered by human laws],' etc.[160] If only this were false! However, I call it 'Christian,' not 'evangelical' or 'apostolic' teaching, that is, what is now in use among Christians. For, if what I say is not true, why is there so much dissension among teachers?

24. 'Nowhere is it said expressly [what words Christ used to consecrate the Supper],' etc.[161] Let Zúñiga prove this and call me, not heretical, but forgetful; I know that this is found in Thomas,[162] but I am speaking about Scripture.

25. 'I do not reproach [beggars],' etc.[163] If only all would do what St Paul did! Is there anything impious in showing what is more perfect?

* * * * *

155 CWE 66 22
156 See n29 above.
157 Augustine *Ep ad Ianuarium* CSEL 34.2 209–10
158 See n30 above.
159 Superiors of the Franciscan friars
160 See n31 above.
161 See n32 above.
162 Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae* 3 q 78 art 3
163 See n33 above.

27. 'That Christ [obeyed God] as a son,' etc.[164] Since I have responded to both Zúñiga and Carranza[165] concerning these matters, and at very great length, I wonder why he sings this song to us again.

28. 'The Apostles learned their Greek [from everyday conversation],' etc.[166] They likewise learned their Hebrew in this way. The gift of tongues (which Zúñiga perhaps mistrusts) is not denied if one believes that it may have consisted in someone speaking in the one language he knows and being understood by all, although they speak another tongue. And about this I have responded to Lee.[167]

29. 'In the business,' etc.[168] Since the authors whose various opinions [about oath-taking] I examine are hesitant about this point, I add my own opinion. I do not define; rather I add '*perhaps*.' Not satisfied with this, I add '*truly*' *Christian*,[169] conceding the oath to the weak.

30. 'As the heretics [altered words in the sacred writings],' etc.[170] Zúñiga perhaps imagines that I mean by 'orthodox' the saints and the revered Fathers of the Church; thieves, pimps and adulterers are also orthodox. Those things of which I am complaining are sometimes caused by half-taught scribes. And I am showing that this has happened in some cases.

31. 'The miracles [are mere fables],' etc.[171] I am not reproaching Cyril; rather, I deny that those things have been written by Cyril; they were written by a shameless pettifogger.[172] How does this pertain to the Catholic faith? I do not reproach the godly man; I am defending the excessive reverence shown to him.

32. 'Christ's intention,' etc.[173] Not only Christ's but also the apostles'.[174] I do not therefore condemn necessary wars.

* * * * *

164 See n35 above.
165 For his reply to Zúñiga see pp 69–74 above.
166 See n36 above.
167 CWE 72 255
168 See n37 above.
169 That is, truly Christian people will refrain from the oath in business matters and restrict it to religious contexts.
170 See n38 above.
171 See n39 above.
172 Erasmus had questioned the authenticity of the letter ascribed to Cyril, in which he speaks of the miracles worked by Jerome.
173 See n40 above.
174 He means both Christ and the apostles wanted greater tolerance and decried wars.

34. 'In Jerusalem,' etc.[175] And Jerome, who was living in Palestine, expresses doubt when he records some things about local relics, as if he was lacking confidence. How much less surprising if that were the case nowadays?[176]

35. 'Today,' etc.[177] I say this,[178] meaning the masses and hourly prayers, in which it is not right to hear anything but sacred Scripture and the writings of the most approved men. Now certain chants, hymns, and childish and silly little verses are mixed in. Why does Zúñiga conclude that I condemn what is recited in church? As if everything done in all the sanctuaries was right! On the contrary, I am admonishing the bishops not to permit this to happen in their churches. At present, anyone adds at will whatever he pleases, and without the authority of bishops.

36. 'Those who each day [recite the psalms without understanding],' etc.[179] If meditating means to follow in one's habits the precepts of divine law, as I teach in that passage, do they meditate on the law of the Lord who mumble psalms which they have not understood? Has Paul[180] not instructed us that it is utterly useless to sing the psalms in your spirit unless you do not also sing them in your mind?

37. 'Is not entrusted,' etc.[181] I do not say that [the congregation] cannot be entrusted but I indicate that it is not entrusted to Peter,[182] for we often cannot know whether the man to whom God's flock is entrusted loves God. Certainly it should not be entrusted to anyone except to one who loves Christ. Do I not teach here what St Ambrose and others teach as well?[183]

* * * * *

175 See n42 above. The passage cited by Zúñiga questioned the authenticity of relics.

176 The edition published in Nuremberg, 1524, adds: 'But Zúñiga is concerned on behalf of sailors, I believe. And I am surprised he says nothing about his Santiago de Compostela.' Erasmus means that Zúñiga wanted relics to be considered genuine because that belief fostered pilgrimages. This in turn profited sailors who took pilgrims to Palestine. The shrine of Santiago de Compostela in Spain (thus 'his' Santiago) was another popular attraction for religious tourists.

177 See n43 above.

178 That is, that the 'fancies of monks and nonsense of women' are given parity with Scripture.

179 See n44 above.

180 1 Cor 14:14–15

181 See n45 above. Erasmus says that the flock of Christ is entrusted only to those who love Christ.

182 Erasmus means, the rock on which Christ built his church was not Peter personally, but Peter's faith. This was also Ambrose's interpretation (see next note).

183 Ambrose *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* CSEL 32.4 275

Thus I do not take away the jurisdiction from bad bishops. For I think Zúñiga suspected this.

38. 'The creed,' etc. This dispute[184] at one time occupied Valla.[185] Let Zúñiga prove his point concerning such an important matter.

39. 'The story [of the flaying of St Bartholomew is implausible],' etc.[186] This indeed is true since as yet I have discovered no church which reads that story. And if there is a church somewhere which does recite it, what then? Would that the church read only this story!

40. 'I do not heed,' etc.[187] He cites a fragment of the argument from a declamation,[188] in which it is lawful to use even false arguments, since it is a rhetorical exercise. I do not know why Zúñiga unjustly blames me. I call sexual desire 'ugly,' not because it is always conjoined with sin but because it is shameful and beastly. There was sexual desire before the Fall but it was not yet detestable.

41. 'Today,' etc.[189] Aurelius Augustine[190] at one time made the same complaint. How much more justified is his complaint in our day! These regulations are introduced by the superstitious; others are approved by the bishops; others again are tolerated by them. Because they inundate us beyond measure, I advise that those excesses should be corrected.

42. 'The whole,' etc. I would wish that this[191] were false in the extreme, but alas! it cannot be denied! If it is heretical to deplore this, it would be equally heretical to say that the whole life of Christians abounds with intrigues, with treacheries, with envious disparaging, with adulteries, with drunkenness. However, I have responded to this malicious accusation in a published booklet.[192]

* * * * *

184 That is, whether the so-called Apostles' Creed was composed by the apostles themselves or not; the Apostles' Creed arose very early; a version of it was in common use at baptisms by 100 AD.

185 The humanist Lorenzo Valla (1407–57) was accused of holding heretical views about the Apostles' Creed and was investigated in 1443–7. He had shown that it was not literally created by the apostles.

186 See n47 above.

187 See n48 above.

188 That is, Erasmus' *Praise of Marriage*, in which he argues that sexual desire is natural (CWE 25 136).

189 See n49 above. The passage concerns the superstitious observation of regulations about the choice of foods.

190 Augustine in *Ep* 55 CSEL 34 210

191 Erasmus said that restrictions on food were observed too superstitiously in his time.

192 That is, in his *Apologia adversus Stunicae Blasphemiae et impietates*; see n5 above.

This page intentionally left blank

A LETTER IN RESPONSE TO ZÚÑIGA

Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam

translated and annotated by
ALEXANDER DALZELL†

(ASD IX-8 305–339; LB IX 391–400; Ep 2172)

A LETTER OF DEFENCE IN RESPONSE TO ZÚÑIGA

Erasmus of Rotterdam to Hubertus Barlandus, physician, greeting.
If you want something to amuse you, my dearest Hubertus, here it is! Zúñiga, who appears to be playing the role of the complete buffoon at Rome, published a little book some time ago.[1] I happened upon it at Freiburg when I was going through my belongings, which had been thrown into disarray by the move.[2] Having a little unaccustomed leisure, I skimmed through the book; in it Zúñiga absolves the Old Translator[3] of the charge of making grammatical errors and even goes so far as to assert that all his translations are couched in fine and elegant Latin.

Isn't that a magnificent proclamation![4] To bolster his case he uses arguments that are patently false and some that are highly controversial. It is obvious nonsense to claim, as he does in the preface, that like the jackdaw in Aesop,[5] I ransacked the commentaries of Lorenzo Valla and suppressing

* * * * *

1 *Assertio* (not *Apologia*, as Allen and Gerlo) *ecclesiasticae translationis Novi Testamenti a soloecismis quos illi Erasmus Roterodamus impegerat* (Rome n pr 1524). Zúñiga says that he went to Rome mainly to visit the curia; but de Jonge suggests that his principal motive may have been a desire to prod the church into acting against Erasmus (*Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione* ASD IX-2 21).

2 When Basel went over to the Reformation, Erasmus moved to Freiburg in April 1529; see Epp 2136:1–23; 2143:5–6; 2145:35–37.

3 The 'Old Translator' is the translator of the Vulgate, whom Erasmus always differentiates from Jerome. On the history of the Vulgate see Bruce M. Metzger *The Text of the New Testament* third edition (Oxford 1992) 72–9, 251–3.

4 Greek in the original: *Audis magnificam προσεπιφώνησιν*.

5 The jackdaw is proverbial for thievery. In Aesop's fables (1.3) a jackdaw dresses himself in peacock feathers; the peacocks attack him and pluck out his borrowed plumes; see *Adagia* III vi 91.

the name of the author, offered another man's work as my own.[6] In fact, it was I who took the initiative and, by my own efforts and at my own expense, arranged for the publication of Valla's commentaries in Paris. Second, there are numerous points in my work which Lorenzo never touched. Finally, in the work itself I often cite Valla by name. Did he really expect me to mention Lorenzo Valla in every instance, however trivial, especially when the book was available? Moreover, to hold that the present Vulgate is the text which St Jerome corrected at the request of Damasus is so debatable that it could be counted a manifest blunder.[7]

So much for the promises of his prologue; now for his triumphant conclusion! He boasts that nothing is more satisfying than to expose to the whole world the ignorance and illiteracy of someone to whom many people previously attributed some degree of knowledge. He often preens himself on his superiority over Erasmus, not just in sacred, but also in profane letters, in which, he says, I have a high opinion of myself. How easy it is to be eloquent when you allow yourself to invent anything that takes your fancy! But I never boasted any particular skill in either sacred or profane letters. If Zúñiga claims such distinction, let him take pleasure in his own estimation – I shall not object. However, he need not be too satisfied with his victory, for there are more than ten thousand men alive today to whom I gladly yield the palm[8] in every branch of learning.

I wish Zúñiga were as erudite as he claims to be. Is there anything sillier than to consider a man more learned simply because he can pick holes in another man's work, especially in a work that covers a varied field? I

* * * * *

6 The reference is to Erasmus' frequent use in his annotations of Valla's notes on the New Testament, which he had discovered in an abbey near Louvain. Erasmus edited and published these in 1505 with the title: *Laurentii Vallensis viri tam graecae quam latinae linguae peritissimi in latinam Novi Testamenti interpretationem ex collatione graecorum exemplarium adnotationes apprime utiles* (J. Bade: Paris 1505); see Ep 182.

7 Pope Damasus I (d 384) commissioned Jerome to revise the Latin New Testament in the light of Greek texts. Erasmus held that the texts of the Vulgate New Testament current in his time do not faithfully represent Jerome's work; see the *Apologia* Holborn 165:26–9 LB VI f.**2r: 'It is uncontested among scholars that this edition of the New Testament [ie the Vulgate] is not Jerome's as it was corrected by him.' Elsewhere in this letter he speaks of Jerome as the translator of the Old Testament.

8 The Latin is *herbam porrigo*, literally 'proffer grass'; for this proverbial expression see *Adagia* I ix 78.

would not consider myself fit to hold a chamber pot to Ermolao Barbaro,[9] if he were alive today, and yet there is much in his writings that I could reasonably object to. Niccolò Leoniceno[10] criticized certain points in Pliny; does that automatically make him a better scholar? In certain passages I take issue with St Augustine, Ambrose, and Thomas, and not without justification; does that make me more learned than they? Aulus Gellius pointed out a memory lapse in Marcus Cicero.[11] According to Augustine grammarians found solecisms in the best writings of the orators.[12] I too can show you several errors which I have commented on in Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome. A cobbler found something amiss in a painting of Apelles;[13] will he now boast of being a better painter than Apelles? Surely everyone can see how stupid this is – and it would still be stupid even if he had found a serious and embarrassing lapse.

Now consider the trivial achievements for which Zúñiga celebrates such splendid triumphs! He stirs up a storm over a wrongly numbered chapter,[14] caused perhaps by the carelessness of the printers – for this is how most errors arise. But suppose I was at fault, either through lapse of memory or a slip of the pen, why should Zúñiga congratulate himself on a service that is often performed for me by my secretaries and amanuenses? It is difficult to write a volume of annotations. On the other hand, nothing is easier, in dealing with a long work, than to play the role of Momus[15] and point to some blemish that has passed unnoticed. Then, if he has set out to prove the Translator innocent of any faults of style, why does he ignore so

* * * * *

9 '… hold a chamber pot to,' *Adagia* I v 94. Ermolao Barbaro (1453/4–93) was a distinguished Venetian diplomat and scholar, best remembered for his brilliant corrections in the text of the Elder Pliny. Erasmus admired him, but mentions elsewhere that he was not infallible: see Epp 1341A:553–7; 1482:54.

10 Niccolò Leoniceno of Vicenza, 1428–1524, distinguished scholar and physician, author of *De Plinii et aliorum erroribus in medicina* (L. de Rossi and A de Grassis: Ferrara 1492)

11 Gellius (15.18) records a mistake made by Nepos in his biography of Cicero, not by Cicero himself. There is no reference in Gellius to a lapse on Cicero's part.

12 Augustine *De ordine* 2.17.15 PL 32 1016. There is an interesting discussion of solecisms in translation at *De doctrina christiana* 2.13.19 PL 34 44.

13 Apelles was the most celebrated of the Greek painters. For the cobbler's criticism see Pliny *Naturalis historia* 35.85, cited in *Adagia* I vi 16.

14 Zúñiga, *Assertio* C 4v, criticized Erasmus for citing Acts 8:7 as Acts 7:7 in the *Soloecismi*. The error is corrected in LB.

15 Momus is the traditional Greek prototype of the carping critic, first mentioned in the *Theogony* of Hesiod (line 214).

many passages criticized by me?[16] Is it not madness to try desperately to rid Scripture of the very qualities that the worthiest of men claim to be the glory of Scripture, that it is 'not in the persuasive words of human wisdom,' etc?[17] And the writer of books of this sort accuses me of obtuseness! I am not in the least offended by the charge – though it amuses me that it is made by Zúñiga. But not to delay you any longer, I shall say a word or two about each of the passages in turn.

1. Matthew, chapter 5<:41>. I criticize the Translator for departing from the Evangelist's words and adding *alia duo* ['another two'] after *mille passus* ['a thousand paces'].[18] Zúñiga says that *alia duo* is rightly understood in the sense *alia duo milia* ['two other thousands'], since *mille* ['thousand'] precedes. But the preceding *mille* is an adjective, not a noun. It is not a question of what can be understood, but of correctness of language. Would you consider it good Latin to say something like *Do tibi mille nummos, cras daturus alia duo* ['I am giving you a thousand coins and will give you two other tomorrow']? He will be able to justify himself, if he can find such an expression in good authors. But since it is absurd in itself and is not found in any of the ancients, what is the point of Zúñiga's quibbles? But, he says, *mille passus* precedes, to which *alios duos mille passus* cannot function as the corresponding form. In any case was there any need to say *mille duos passus*, since Matthew wrote *μίλιον*, that is 'a mile'? And if there was a compelling reason for preferring *mille passus*, he could have said *alteros bis mille.*[19] Could Zúñiga have written a sillier note? And yet he concludes that the translation here is both elegant and correct.

2. Matthew 6<:16>. In the course of pointing out an error, I changed the order of the words, writing *magis pluris estis vos* instead of *vos magis pluris estis* [literally, 'are you of more greater account']; Zúñiga denounces me for my

* * * * *

16 That is, criticized in my *Annotations*; Erasmus stressed that the problems cited in the *Solecisms* are only a few selected out of many. To defend the Vulgate throughout would be a major task. Moreover, the defence would seem futile to many, since in their view the simple, colloquial language of Scripture is part of its glory.

17 1 Cor 2:4: 'and my speech and my preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in shewing of the Spirit and power.' (DV)

18 The Latin for a mile is *mille passus*, literally 'a thousand paces' (where *mille* is an adjective). For two miles or more one must use the noun *milia* ('thousands'). The Vulgate translation awkwardly combines these two constructions.

19 As an alternative to *duo milia* ('two thousands') Erasmus suggests *bis mille* ('twice a thousand'), where the adverb *bis* modifies the adjective *mille*.

lapse of memory, as if that were relevant to the point at issue. He defends the Translator with the argument that the doubling of the comparative is modelled on Hebrew idiom. But this is precisely how most solecisms arise – by Latin speakers taking over the idioms of a foreign tongue. If we admit Zúñiga's argument here, then it will be correct to say *ut figura dicere* for 'so to speak,' because *ὡς τύπῳ εἰπεῖν* is good Greek. Similarly, instead of saying *incumbit in hanc rem* ['he applies himself to this'] we could say *ille iacet ibi supra ad* because that is how we say it in our language.[20] If I had the inclination or the leisure to cite other examples, what peals of laughter I could raise among the learned! Yet these are the famous annotations[21] with which Zúñiga demonstrates to the world his encyclopaedic learning and Erasmus' total ignorance of letters.

At this point he throws out another anchor to secure his craft. In Plautus we read:[22]

> *Nam nisi qui argentum dederit, nugas egerit:*
> *Qui dederit, magis maiores nugas egerit.*
> ['For unless he gives the money, he will seem a fool:
> If he does give it, he will seem a greater fool.']

In the first place, who ever modelled his prose on the free and archaic style of Plautus? Second, the Plautine verse does not scan, unless you elide the 's' in *magis*. More probably the reading should be:

> *Qui dederit is maiores nugas egerit.*[23]

So much for Erasmus' egregious error!

* * * * *

20 In our language, ie Dutch; the Latin, of course, makes no sense. Its literal meaning would be, 'he lies there over to'! Erasmus must have in mind some such Dutch phrase as, 'hij legt zich daarop toe' meaning 'he applies himself to ….'

21 The specific reference here is to the *Assertio* of 1524, not the *Annotationes* of 1520, although 'annotations' is a suitable general description of Zúñiga's polemical writings against Erasmus.

22 Plautus *Menaechmi* 54-5. The double comparison is not uncommon in Plautus. But Erasmus dismisses Zúñiga's Plautine example on two grounds, first, that Plautus is not an acceptable model for prose, and second, that the line can be shown on metrical grounds to be corrupt.

23 Erasmus' emendation involves substituting *is majores* ('he [will seem] a greater') for *magis majores* (literally, 'a more greater'). The emendation has not been accepted by editors. The line is usually scanned with the 's' in *magis* elided. Metre: iambic senarius.

3. Now for something more egregious still! In the same chapter,[24] he insists that the Translator's *videbis eiicere* ['you will see a casting out'] is sound Latin for *dispicies ut eiicias* ['you will see clearly to cast out']. On what grounds? Because the Greek text is *διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν*. He is following his own rule,[25] whose silliness I have just pointed out. Then he adds this outrageous comment, that *videbis eiicere* means to Latin ears exactly what *διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν* means to Greek. Olive no kernel hath, nor nut no shell.[26] Here the wretched crow has lost a feather (if I may borrow his favourite joke).[27]

4. But he is soon to lose another feather with more disastrous consequences! Matthew 8<:29>. He claims that *quid nobis et tibi* ['what to us and to you'] is an elegant equivalent for *quid tibi nobiscum* ['what have you to do with us']. How does he arrive at this? Why, even a blind man could see that this is how it is said in Hebrew, and the Evangelist, from whose words we must never depart, preserved the Hebrew idiom! He concludes by pointing out that Jerome employed the same expression in the eleventh chapter of Judges.[28] Would anyone believe that Zúñiga was sober when he wrote these things? Is it never possible to depart from the Evangelist's words at any point? Why, then, has the Translator done just this in hundreds of passages? Why did Jerome depart from the Hebrew idiom everywhere in the Old Testament? Had he not done so, can you imagine anything more grotesque than the style that would have resulted? What strange rules this fool prescribes for us, quite different from those Jerome laid down in his *De optimo genere interpretandi*![29]

* * * * *

24 The reference is not to chapter 6, but to chapter 7:5.

25 The rule that it is unobjectionable to translate a foreign idiom literally.

26 A proverbial line from Horace's *Epistles* 2.1.31, which Erasmus uses of those who insist on the truth of what is patently false; see *Adagia* I ix 73.

27 For the adage see n5, where the bird is called a *graculus* ('jackdaw'); here, and at Horace *Epistles* 1.3.19, it is a *corvus* ('crow').
In his discussion of this passage in the *Assertio* (A 4r) Zúñiga ends as follows: 'This feather, like the one which follows, belongs to Erasmus, but both feathers are so poorly formed that they have fallen out at once, or rather have been torn out by the root.'

28 Judges 11:2; the Vulgate has 'Quid mihi et tibi est …?'

29 The title 'On the best type of translation' was given by Jerome himself to his letter to Pammachius (*Ep* 57). He argues for a freer kind of translation 'according to the sense' in preference to a literal translation 'according to the word,' although he makes an exception for Scripture; see *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57)* ed G.J.M. Bartelink (Leiden 1980).

5. Matthew 11<:1>. He maintains that *cum consummasset praecipiens* ['when he had finished while instructing'] is good Latin for *cum fecisset praecipiendi finem* ['when he had made an end of instructing']. By what rule? Because it reproduces the Greek idiom. So it will be good Latin to translate *μέμνημαι ἐλθών* as *memini veniens* ['I remember coming'] rather than *memini me venisse* ['I remember that I came'].[30]

6. The same chapter<, verse 5>. He thinks that *pauperes evangelizantur* ['the poor are being evangelized'] is Latin for *pauperibus adfertur bonus nuntius* ['the good news is brought to the poor']; at the same time he admits that such an expression is unfamiliar to Latin ears. This is like saying 'This is a gold coin, though it has no gold in it,' for it is the practice of Latin speakers that constitutes the norm of proper Latin. He poses the question: if someone, following Greek usage, said *eos annuntiari* ['that they are being announced'] of those to whom something is announced, would Erasmus forbid him to do so? As far as I am concerned, Zúñiga may speak this way if he likes, but it won't be Latin, for this is precluded by the practice of Latin speakers – unless he thinks we could use *creditus* of a person to whom something has been entrusted, or *bene passus* of one who has been done a good turn. Then he lashes out at Valla for committing a shameful error when he suggests that *εὐαγγελίζονται* is used here '*active*.'[31] Zúñiga derived this criticism from my annotation, but he parades it as though it were his own – something he does regularly throughout the book; and yet he portrays me as Aesop's poor crow, while he stands out resplendent in his own plumage.[32]

* * * * *

30 In certain circumstances a noun clause in Greek can be translated by a participle 'I remember *coming*'; in Latin this requires the accusative and infinitive construction.

31 There is a confusion here over the meaning of the Latin term *active*, which is used both of the active voice and of a transitive verb. Valla probably meant that the use of the Greek verb here is transitive. Zúñiga thought he meant to say that it is active, which it clearly is not. See Valla's note on Matt 11:5 in *Annotationes* in *Omnia opera* ed E. Garin (Turin 1962) I 812. Erasmus had pointed out in his annotation on this verse (*Pauperes evangelizantur:* LB VI 59) that the Greek verb can be used transitively in the active voice ('I evangelize you') or intransitively ('I preach the gospel to you'). The former, when turned into the passive, gives the construction here ('the poor are evangelized'). But such a construction is not acceptable in classical Latin.

32 See n5.

7. He is also greatly amused by my criticism that in chapter 15<:1> the Translator wrote *scribae ab Hierosolymis* ['scribes from Jerusalem'] instead of *scribae Hierosolymitani* ['scribes of Jerusalem'], for he imagines there is no difference.[33] So in future it will be good Latin to say *Stunica ab Hispania delirat Romae* ['Zúñiga from Spain is raving like a madman at Rome'] for *Stunica Hispanus delirat Romae*[34] ['Zúñiga, the Spaniard, is raving like a madman at Rome']. Besides being grammatically incorrect, this expression has the fault of ambiguity.

8. Matthew 20<:25>. *Principes gentium dominantur eorum* ['the rulers of the gentiles exercise sovereignty *of* them']. He says that the Translator was not unaware that *ἐννῶν* is neuter, but was concerned rather with the sense.[35] That would be a plausible explanation if in many other passages the Translator had not stubbed his toe against the same rock;[36] for example, in one of the Psalms: *spiritus Domini replevit orbem terrarum, et hoc quod continet omnia* ['the Spirit of the Lord has filled the whole earth, and this which contains all things …'].[37]

Again, if I had found *dominantur eorum* anywhere in a good author, I would not have condemned it as a solecism. Zúñiga cites no authority, which I am sure he would have done, had he been aware of any.

9. Same chapter<, verse 28>. In Zúñiga's view it is correct to use *ministrari* ['to be served'] of someone to whom a service is done.[38] By what rule? 'Because,' he says, 'the Greeks speak this way.' So by the same token it will be correct to

* * * * *

33 Adverbial phrases in Latin of the type *ab Hierosolymis* are generally construed with a verb, not used to qualify a noun. In this example there is a further problem of ambiguity, for the sentence could mean that scribes (whose home was elsewhere) came to Jesus from Jerusalem.

34 LB has *Roma* for *Romae*, an obvious printing error.

35 Two points are made here: first, that *eorum*, which is neuter, agrees with the Greek word for 'gentiles' rather than its Latin equivalent, *gentium*, which is feminine; second, the Latin verb *dominari* in the sense 'to exercise sovereignty over' should be followed by the dative case, not the genitive; the genitive is the Greek construction.

36 A Latin proverb, cf Cicero *Epistolae ad familiares* 10.20.2; Ausonius *Epigrams* 11

37 The quotation is not from the Psalms, but from the Book of Wisdom 1:7. The whole verse runs as follows: 'The spirit of the Lord hath filled the whole world: and that which containeth all things hath knowledge of the voice.' (DV)

38 In classical Latin *ministro* is used in the passive of things being furnished or supplied, not of persons being served.

use *committi* ['to be entrusted'] of someone to whom something is entrusted. And this is the great expert who accuses me of pettifoggery!

10. Matthew 22<:10>. He believes that *impletae sunt nuptiae discumbentium* ['the wedding was filled *of* guests'] is Latin because Virgil said *implentur veteris vini*[39] ['they fill themselves with old wine']. Does he imagine that anything is possible in prose if it was said by the poets either to give their work the patina of antiquity or as an invention of their own? If *plenus vini* ['full of wine'] is correct, it does not follow automatically that *impletus vini* ['filled of wine'] is Latin, nor if one can say in Latin *homo vini plenus* ['a man full of wine'], does that justify *domus impleta convivarum* ['a house filled of guests']. The example he cites from Cicero, *neque ollam denariorum implere*[40] is silly; for the genitive does not depend on *implere* ['to fill'], but on *ollam*, a jar intended for coins. *Ollam denariorum* means 'a jar intended for storing coins.'

11. The same chapter<, verse 30>. *Neque nubentur* ['nor are they married']. He points out that the ancients said *nubo te* ['I marry you'], hence *nupta* ['married' (of a woman)] and *nuptus* ['married' (of a man)]. I admit that this was said in antiquity, but only in the dim and distant past. To imitate this now is to commit a solecism. Although St Jerome points out that the Translator has used a Greek idiom, one, however, that does not correspond to Latin practice,[41] Zúñiga, in spite of this, asserts that it is Latin. But how else are we to define a solecism except as a departure from the usage of those who speak correctly?

His next point is delicious! In discussing the purity of the Latin language, he offers us Tertullian as an authority. Equally silly is his inference that, because Tertullian wrote *ubi non nubitur*, we can say *nubor.*[42] By the same reasoning we can say *vivor*, because Terence said *ubi non vere vivitur*,[43] and

* * * * *

39 *Aeneid* 1.215; Virgil actually wrote *implentur veteris Bacchi* ['they fill themselves with old Bacchus']. The genitive after *implere* is rare in poetry in the high style.

40 Cicero *Epistulae ad familiares* 9.18.4; Erasmus understands this phrase to mean, 'to fill a jar intended for coins,' not 'to fill a jar with coins.'

41 Jerome *Comm in Matt* 22.30 PL 26 164C

42 Tertullian uses *nubo* in the passive, but in the impersonal form *nubitur* ['a marriage takes place']; see, eg *Ad uxorem* 1.5.20. *Nubo* in Latin is an intransitive verb, as are the verbs in the following examples, *vivo* ['I live'] and *dormio* ['I sleep']. Such verbs can be used impersonally in the passive, ie with the subject 'it,' but not with a personal subject. So *nubor, dormior*, etc are solecisms.

43 Terence *Heautontimorumenos* 154: 'where one does not live aright'

dormior, because Juvenal said *minimum dormitur in illo*.[44] What a Chrysippus he is! And in his eyes I am Arasmus![45]

12. Chapter 24<:6>. With the help of Suetonius he argues that *opiniones bellorum* ['opinions of wars'] is good Latin [for 'rumours of wars']. On what evidence? First, because the Greek text has *ἀκοάς*.[46] But if it is not permissible to depart from the Evangelist's words, as Zúñiga stated earlier, then we should say *auditus* ['hearings'] or *auditus bellorum* ['the hearings of wars']. Second, those with more exacting standards for defining the purity of Latin will reject Suetonius from the roster of good judges.[47] What, in any case, did Suetonius say? *Exiit opinio decessurum eum* ['the opinion went out that he would depart'].[48] What is the relevance of this to *opiniones bellorum*? There is no evidence for *opiniones bellorum*, especially in the plural. But Ambrose uses this expression. Of course, but he does so when quoting the words of Scripture.[49] Nor does the fact that Ambrose said it make it Latin.

13. I had pointed out that, because *ὅτι* has more than one meaning in Greek, the Translator mistakenly uses *quia* for *quod*.[50] *Quod* is sometimes used specifically,[51] but *quia* always implies causality. Zúñiga holds that it makes no difference whether you say *quia* or *quod*, and that phrases such as *recte dixisti*,

* * * * *

44 Juvenal 6.269: 'one sleeps very little in it'

45 Chrysippus was one of the founders of Stoicism, famed for his work on logic and for the subtlety of his argument; for the 'subtleties of Chrysippus' see LB IV 467B. 'Arasmus,' a distortion of Erasmus' name, is derived from the Latin verb *aro* meaning 'to plough.' So the nickname suggests 'ploughman'; see Ep 2468:92.

46 Corrected from *ἀκοαίς*, a slip for *ἀκοάς*

47 *Adagia* I vii 34

48 Suetonius *Nero* 53; Erasmus misquotes. Suetonius' text is *Exiit opinio … descensurum eum* ['the opinion went out … that he would enter as a competitor'].

49 Zúñiga quotes Ambrose on Luke 21:9, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* 10.10 PL 15 1806.

50 In Greek *ὅτι* can mean both 'because' and 'that.' *Quia* means 'because' in classical Latin. In the Vulgate and in medieval Latin (and occasionally in vulgar Latin of the classical period) it is also used meaning 'that,' but Erasmus rejects this as a solecism. *Quod* can mean both 'because' and 'that.'

51 The word for 'specifically' is *εἰδικόν*, which Erasmus employs frequently in the *Annotations* to identify the use of *quod* introducing a noun clause and having the meaning 'that'; see eg *Annotations on Romans* 4:21 and 8:36 CWE 56 125 and 235.

quia virum non habeo[52] and *confessus est, quia non sum ego Christus*[53] are never understood in any other way than that in which Christian people understand them. But I was not concerned with how they were understood, but with the plain meaning of the words themselves. We laugh at jesters when they distort the language, and we understand them, once we have grown used to their errors. One stammerer better understands another.[54] The fact that a phrase is understood does not automatically make it good Latin. Zúñiga says that in this passage the Translator is dealing with a Hebrew, not a Greek idiom. What! Did the Translator translate the Gospels from Hebrew, although they have come down to us in Greek? But even if we suppose that 'chy' has the same meaning in Hebrew as *ὅτι* in Greek, can we then conclude that an expression based on a foreign idiom is Latin? 'The Translator,' he says, 'is following the words of the Evangelist literally, he is therefore translating them into Latin.' As a consequence it is an affront to the Holy Spirit[55] if I say that the Translator made an error, since he translated word for word. But this is the single commonest source of bad translation. Even if I said that there is a solecism in the words of the Evangelist himself, I do not think I would be insulting the Holy Spirit: for the kingdom of God does not rest on purity of language. If it is impious to find fault with a translation that adheres to the language of the Evangelist, then the Translator has acted impiously, since time and time again he departs from the original, even when there was no need to do so. The keenness of this fellow's mind never fails to astonish!

14. Luke 1<:72>. I had criticized the Translator for rendering *μνησθῆναι* by *memorare* ['to remind'] instead of *meminisse* ['to remember'], although one

* * * * *

52 John 4:17. The text in LB has *habes* ('you have') for the Vulgate *habeo* ('I have'), but Erasmus' discussion implies the Vulgate reading.
This example and the following deal with a related problem in the translation of *quia*. The Greek conjunction *ὅτι* is sometimes used to introduce direct speech, where it has no equivalent in English. Thus John 4:17 means: 'You [the Samaritan woman] have rightly said, [*ὅτι*] "I have no husband."' The Vulgate kept the Greek idiom and translated the Greek conjunction by *quia*. But Latin usage, Erasmus argues, would interpret *quia* as introducing a subordinate clause meaning: 'You have rightly said that (*quia*) I [ie Christ] have no husband.' Similarly, the following example could be interpreted as: 'He [John the Baptist] confesses that I [the Evangelist] am not the Christ.'

53 John 1:20

54 *Adagia* I ix 77, an adage conveying the notion that a fool is better at understanding a fool, or that an ignorant person finds an ignorant writer compatible

55 Heb 10:29; cf Matt 12:31–2; Mark 3:29; Luke 12:10

codex has *memorari* ['to be reminded'].[56] Zúñiga imagines that, if we accept that the printer put an 'e' for an 'i,' the solecism miraculously disappears! The problem, however, does not lie there, but in the genitive. *Memorare* is a Latin word and so is *memorari.* But if Zúñiga can show us an example in a good author of *memorari testamenti* for *meminisse* or *recordari testamenti* ['remember the covenant'], he will win the argument.

15. Luke 4<:23>. I criticized the Translator for his frequent mistranslation of the ambiguous Greek word *ὅσα* by *quanta* and of *τοσαῦτα*[57] by *tanta.* Zúñiga maintains that *quanta* ['how great'] and *tanta* ['so great'] are correctly used of number and have the same meaning as *quot* ['how many'] and *tot* ['so many']. To prove this he argues that the usage is frequent in the Translator. If the Translator can be defended in this way, then by this single remedy we can heal all his wounds. Zúñiga should demonstrate that good authors spoke like this and said *tantos habes digitos in pedibus quantos in manibus* ['you have as great toes on your feet as fingers on your hands'] for *tot* and *quot*.

16. Luke 19<:23>. Zúñiga chooses to blame the scribes rather than the Translator for writing *exegissem illud* ['I might have required it'] instead of *illam*.[58] I myself point out in my Annotations that the latter reading is found in some ancient codices.[59] But this is not the only passage where the Translator has nodded in a similar way; here he was misled by the preceding *ἀργύριον* ['money'].

* * * * *

56 *Memorare* is an active verb in classical Latin meaning 'to speak' or 'to remind'; *meminisse* and *recordari* mean 'to remember' and are followed by the genitive case. The proper reading in this verse is *memorari*, a deponent form found elsewhere in the Vulgate and constructed with the genitive like *meminisse*, but this usage is not classical. All the texts consulted by Zúñiga read *memorari* (*Assertio* B 4v).

57 The regular form of *τοταῦτα* is *τοσαῦτα*.

58 The problem here is syntactical. In this, and in several other passages, Erasmus complains about the tendency in the Vulgate to slip into Greek constructions. The Greek word for money is neuter, the Latin equivalent is feminine; the pronoun should, therefore, be feminine in Latin (*illam*). Erasmus thinks the translator has carelessly taken over the gender of the Greek word. Zúñiga proposed to remove the difficulty by emending *illud* (neuter) to *illam* (feminine).

59 See annotation on Luke 19:23 (*Exegissem illud)*, where the Latin codices are identified as two of those from the library of the collegiate church of St Donatian in Bruges. Erasmus visited this library in 1521 and collated four mss there; see annotations on Matt 1:18 (*Mater Jesus Maria*), Matt 3:16 (*Baptizantes autem Jesus*), and 1 John 5:7 (*Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in caelo*).

17. Luke 21<:38>. Zúñiga does a marvellous job of defending the Latinity of *et omnis populus manicabat ad eum* for *mane commeabat ad eum* ('and all the people came to him in the morning')! How does he accomplish this? Well, Horace wrote:[60]

> It has ever been, and ever will be, permissible
> to issue a word stamped with the mark of the present.

What! Is the same licence available to the prose writer as to the poet? Is it the same today as in the time of Flaccus? And does it apply to any word at all? Moreover, should the word not be *maneari* from *mane* rather than *manicare* from *manica*?[61] And was there any need for *manicare*, when we can say *diluculari*? Nor does *ὀρθρίζειν* mean simply 'to rise in the morning,' as Zúñiga claims, but 'to do something in the morning,' just as *pernoctare* is 'to do something at night.'

18. Luke 23<:29>. *ventres quae genuerunt* ['the wombs that bore']. Zúñiga says that the better manuscripts read *qui genuerunt*. But I find *quae* in two of my codices, and since the Translator constantly makes this kind of error, not through ignorance, but from carelessness, *quae* is more likely to have been corrected by later hands than to be the Translator's original text.[62] I do not, however, wish to make an issue of it. In this case Zúñiga may well have been fortunate enough to possess a better text.

19. John 1<:14>. *quasi unigeniti a Patre* ['as if of the only begotten of the Father']. I have shown that the proper Latin is *tamquam* ['as'], since Greek *ὡς* is ambiguous, implying both truth and pretence.[63] Zúñiga does not con-

* * * * *

60 Horace *Ars poetica* 58-9. A few lines later Horace is named Flaccus.

61 The reading of Luke 21:38 has long been disputed. *Manicare* is an odd word, recalling *manica*, which means 'manacle.' Erasmus suggests that we should expect something like *maneari* from *mane* ('morning'), although, as he is aware, the word is not attested in Latin.

62 The point is carelessly expressed. In Erasmus' view *quae* is the original text. He is suggesting that it is easier to suppose that the *qui* found in some manuscripts is a later correction than the original reading. So this would be another example of the tendency in the Vulgate to follow the gender of the Greek original; cf n58. Modern texts favour the reading *qui*.

63 Erasmus argues that *quasi unigeniti* means 'as if he were the only begotten,' implying 'pretence'; *tamquam unigeniti* would mean 'as being the only begotten,' implying that he truly was. The Greek relative adverb *ὡς* has the meanings of both *quasi* and *tamquam*.

tradict this, but refers us to the words of Jerome, who interprets the passage differently in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, chapter 5.[64] But what is it that Jerome says there? That *gloriam unigeniti* ['the glory of the only begotten'] should not be read as though there existed another only begotten whose glory Christ also shared; rather we should understand that the Father conferred an honour on Christ, not as one of the saints, but as the only begotten. This comment is either irrelevant to the point at issue or it tells on my side. For if there is another son of God, then Christ is not the only begotten, but like to the only begotten. To arrive at Jerome's interpretation one had to read *tamquam*, not *quasi.* I am not impressed by the fact that, when Roman eloquence was already in sad decline, we find writers using *tamquam* and *quasi* differently. Here Lorenzo[65] and Erasmus are on the same side

20. John 4<:9>. I criticized *coutuntur* as a solecism.[66] 'But in Greek,' says Zúñiga, 'we have *συγχρῶνται*; so the Translator could not have found a better version' (I am happy to quote Zúñiga's own words). What prodigious nonsense! Is proper translation to be defined as rendering the text word for word? Can anyone believe the fellow is in his right mind? He admits the expression is never found in Latin, and yet he wants it to be accepted as proper Latin!

21. John 6<:21>. He wants *navis fuit ad terram* ['the boat was at the land'] to be counted as Latin and suspects John wrote *ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*, although the agreement of all the manuscripts is against it.[67] If he can cite a single Latin author who spoke like this, he will have made his point. As it is, he is wasting his breath.

22. John 7<:14>. He wants *festo mediante* ['the feast being in the middle'] to be accepted as Latin. He has no argument to support this except that it is permissible to invent a word on the analogy of the Greek.[68] I realize there are instances of this among the Fathers, but we are not permitted the same

* * * * *

64 Jerome *Comm. in Eph* 5:33 PL 26 569–70

65 Lorenzo Valla *Annotationes* on John 1:14, *Opera omnia* (Turin 1962) I 840

66 *Coutuntur* is a non-classical word, used here in the Vulgate with the meaning 'to have mutual dealings with.'

67 The Greek preposition *ἐπί* can be followed by the accusative or the genitive case. Here it has the genitive. Zúñiga would like to change this to the accusative to justify the Vulgate's *ad terram*.

68 Latin words are coined from Greek in two ways, either by transliteration, eg *idololatria* ('idolatry') from the Greek *εἰδωλολατρεία* (Jerome *In Isaiam* 57 PL 24 551B) or by developing a new word on the analogy of the Greek, eg *essentia*

licence. Otherwise, think of the dreadful consequences for our style if we allowed ourselves such liberty in translating Greek!

23. John 14<:12>. The only argument he adduces in defence of *et maiora horum faciet* ['and he will do greater works *of* these'][69] is that the Translator has reproduced the idiom of the Greek. True, but by this very act he has committed a solecism – unless it would be good Latin to say *pater maior mei est* ['my father is greater of me'] for *pater maior me est* ['my father is greater than I'].

24. John 15<:2>. He defends *ut fructum plus adferat* ['that it may bring forth fruit the more'] on the supposition that the passage has been corrupted by the scribes, although no codex can be found containing the desired reading.[70]

25. Same chapter<, verse 6>, *et colliget ea* ['and they will gather those things']. Zúñiga reads *eum* ['it']. How is that possible when the Evangelist wrote *αὐτά* ['them']? I admit that the preceding word is *κλῆμα* ['branch'], not *κλήματα* ['branches'], but I have shown that in such cases it does not matter whether you use the singular or the plural.[71] Zúñiga should have consulted my annotation on the point; had he done so, he would not have wasted so many words. Zúñiga thinks that *αὐτό* ['it'] should be read for *αὐτά* ['them']. Although no codex has this reading, he takes it upon himself to pronounce the passage corrupt. If I did anything like that, you can imagine what an outcry there would be, how loudly he would bellow that Erasmus is correcting the words of the Evangelist!

Earlier, in dealing with *ὅτι*, when I said that the Translator had reproduced the Greek idiom, Zúñiga would not hear of it and chose instead to claim that honour for his special language.[72] Here, when I commented that

* * * * *

('essence') coined on the analogy of *οὐσία*. Both methods were criticized by purists; see Quintilian *Institutio oratoria* 8.3.33. Clearly it is the second method that Erasmus is referring to here.

69 The problem here (in '*of* these') is the use of the genitive (*horum*) to express comparison, 'greater … than these.' Latin employs an ablative in this construction.

70 To express the desired meaning classical Latin would use a partitive genitive *plus fructus* ('more of fruit'). Modern texts of the Vulgate retain the reading *fructum plus*.

71 In his annotation on the passage Erasmus showed that both the singular and the plural are used in referring to a genus. Thus, he argues, it is equally possible to say 'The elephant has its young …' or 'elephants have their young.'

72 In the context this 'special language' must be Hebrew (*suus* in the sense 'his own,' 'his special'); in the *Assertio* B3v Zúñiga argues that the use of *quia* for *quod* in the Vulgate reflects a Hebrew, not a Greek idiom.

the repetition of the relative pronoun reflected a Hebrew idiom,[73] Zúñiga scoffed and said, 'How could the Translator have done this when Hebrew was not his language?' What utter nonsense! Do Latin writers not frequently reproduce a Greek idiom, although they are not Greek speakers? Here the Evangelist followed the Hebrew idiom and the Translator preserved it. However, in considering the issue of grammatical correctness, what does it matter whether it was through imitation of a Hebrew or a Greek idiom that the Translator abandoned strict Latin usage? But Zúñiga denies that John's use of a Hebrew idiom and the Translator's imitation of the Greek constitutes a fault in either language. He says, 'It is not a mistake in grammar to speak in this way.' Oh, what rules he lays down!

26. Acts 2<:12>. I had complained that *ad invicem* for *inter se* ['one to another'] can hardly be called Latin.[74] Zúñiga supports it with the following defence: first, the Translator frequently uses such language, therefore it is good Latin; second, Valla found no fault with the passage, so there is nothing wrong with it; finally, Apuleius wrote *derepente*.[75] It follows, I suppose, that we can add a preposition to any adverb at all and claim as Latin *ad extra*, *ad intra*, *ad supra*, and *ad infra*. This is amazing scholarship!

27. Acts 3<:19>. I had criticized the use of *poenitemini* ['repent'] as poor Latin. Zúñiga attacks me on two fronts. 'Valla,' he says, 'found no fault with the passage, and the Fathers wrote *poenitemini*.' How does he reach this conclusion? By arguing that, if the word was not correct, Valla would have condemned it. What extraordinary logic!

28. Acts 5<:4>. *venundatum erat in tua potestate* ['when sold, was in your power'], although the preceding word was *ager*. Zúñiga thinks the manuscripts corrupt, although he can adduce no evidence from any of them, and in so many places the Translator stubs his toe against this same stone.[76]

* * * * *

73 The point at issue of the Hebrew idiom is set out in the *Solecisms* on John 15:6. The repetition is in verse 5: '*Who* abideth in me and I in him, *he* bringeth forth ….'

74 *Ad inuicem* is a combination of a preposition ('to') and an adverb ('in turn') to form an idiom meaning 'to one another.' Such combinations are non-classical, but common in the Vulgate.

75 Apuleius *Apologia* 74. The form 'derepente' is also found in early Latin, but is rejected in the classical period.

76 Cf n36. Again a problem of grammatical agreement: *uenundatum* is a neuter participle, but its antecedent is the masculine word *ager.*

29. Acts, chapter 8<:7>. *multi autem eorum, qui habebant Spiritus immundos, clamantes voce magna exibant* ['many of those who had unclean spirits, crying with a loud voice, came out']. Zúñiga excuses the absurdity of the text by claiming the passage was corrupted by the copyists. But the agreement of all the manuscripts argues against this.[77]

30. Acts 10<:16>. *ἐπὶ τρίς* ['thrice'] is translated by *per ter* ['during thrice']. 'But,' says Zúñiga, 'this is the proper Latin translation precisely because this is how it is in Greek.' On the contrary this is a bad Latin translation precisely because Latin usage does not admit the Greek idiom, and it is usage that defines correct speech. In any case the Greek implies *ad ter* ['up to thrice'], not *per ter* ['during thrice']. So this shifty argument of Zúñiga's affords the Translator no defence.

31. Acts 16<:13>. Zúñiga maintains that *foras portas* ['to outside the gates'] for *extra portas* ['outside the gates'] is good Latin. What is his argument? 'Because,' he says, 'certain adverbs are used in place of prepositions.' But where? Oh, in this very passage and in the Psalms, *subtus pedes*.[78] I am aware that some prepositions take on the character of adverbs, but I have not yet discovered an example of the opposite.[79] However, suppose this does occur with one or two adverbs: will that automatically make it acceptable for all?

32. Acts 17<:15>. He excuses the translation of *ὡς τάχιστα* ['as quickly as possible'] by *quam celeriter* ['how quickly'] with the claim that the same type of expression is found in Cicero, although he produces no example. But since earlier he promulgated the law that there should be no departure from the words of the Evangelist, here the Translator has been guilty of two sins, first by substituting a positive for a superlative, and second, by using an expression that is contrary to Latin usage.

* * * * *

77 Modern editions of the Vulgate preserve the Latin text, which Zúñiga regarded as corrupt. He conjectured *ex multis* for *multi* (*Assertio* c 4v).

78 Ps 18:38 (Vulg 17:39): 'under the feet'

79 Erasmus is mistaken here; many Latin prepositions, eg *circa*, began as adverbs. Erasmus seems to have believed that the process worked in reverse. He is right, however, to criticize *foras*, which is not used as a preposition except in late and vulgar Latin.

33. Acts 20<:32>. *commendo vos Deo et gratiae eius qui potest, etc.*[80] I had suggested that the translation should be *quod* ['which'] referring back to *uerbum* ['word']. Zúñiga argues for *qui potest* ['who is able'], referring to the preceding *Deo*. I admit this is possible but extremely harsh. If the antecedent is 'God,' he could have written *τοῦ δνναμένου*.[81]

34. The same chapter<, verse 24>, *neque facio animam meam pretiosiorem quam me* ['neither count I my life dearer than myself']. To defend the Translator, Zúñiga corrects Luke[82] despite the fact that no Greek manuscript has an alternative reading.[83] Why does he do this? Because Lorenzo passed over the passage without comment! What a logician!

35. Acts 21<:14>. In order to show that *cum suadere ei non possemus* ['when we could not advise him'] is Latin [for 'when we could not persuade him'], he hesitates between suggesting a scribal error (*suadere* ['advise'] written for *persuadere* ['persuade']) and believing that the Translator used *suadere* in the sense of *persuadere*. If he prefers the former, he should offer evidence, even from a single codex; if the latter, then he is admitting that the Translator's Latin is faulty.

36. Acts 26<:2>. *de omnibus quibus accusor* ['concerning all the counts on which I am arraigned']. He thinks it does not matter whether you add or omit the preposition.[84] So in his view it is of no account whether you say *accusavit illum variis rebus* ['he accused him on various charges'] or *variis de rebus* ['of various things'], whether you say *multis accusor* ['I am accused on many charges'] or *de multis accusor* ['I am accused of many things']. Remember

* * * * *

80 Erasmus (or the text of LB) has omitted *verbo* ('word') before *gratiae* ('grace'): 'I commend you to God and to the *word* of his grace who is able.'

81 The Greek text has the dative *τῷ δνναμένῳ* ('who is able') which goes naturally with the nearer dative *λόγος* ('word'). Erasmus argues that, if the Evangelist had wanted to make the phrase qualify 'God,' he could have put it in the genitive, agreeing with the adjacent pronoun *αὐτοῦ* ('of him,' ie God).

82 Luke as the writer of the Acts

83 Zúñiga wished to bring the Greek text into conformity with the Vulgate by reading *τιμιωτέραν ἐμαντοῦ* ['dearer than myself'] (*Assertio* D 2v).

84 The distinction which Erasmus makes here is a fine one. The verb *accusor*, 'to accuse,' can be followed either by a simple ablative or by the preposition *de* plus the ablative. Erasmus seems to be suggesting that the simple ablative is used with general accusations ('he is accused on many counts') and *de* plus the ablative in reference to specific charges ('he is accused of extortion').

accusatus est multis criminibus ['he was accused on many charges'] is exactly the same as saying *multis nominibus* ['on many counts']. The word is followed sometimes by the genitive case, sometimes by the ablative, with or without the preposition. Zúñiga makes no distinction among any of these.

He points out that *aestimo* ['I reckon'] for *existimo* ['I think'] is frequently found in Cicero, and says correctly that it is often corrupted in the manuscripts.

He defends *beatum apud te* by connecting *apud te* with what follows. But this makes the word order exceptionally harsh (*apud te cum sim defensurus*, 'before you since I am going to make my defence'). Zúñiga says this is the order of the Greek. But the facts are otherwise: *μέλλων ἀπολογεῖσθαι ἐπὶ σοῦ*, that is, 'because I am about to defend myself before you.'[85]

He defends *omnia quaestiones* by suggesting the passage has been corrupted by the scribes. But in that case he ought to have cited the evidence of the old codices. 'Here,' he says, 'there was no occasion for the Translator to go astray.' This argument will be persuasive if the Translator never made a slip without some reason, never even when it was contrary to reason. In any case there was some occasion for the error, for *πάντα* ['all'] can be either masculine or neuter. Since it would be absurd to translate it as a masculine, he translated it as a neuter, forgetting that he had rendered *ἠθῶν καὶ ζητημάτων* (for which Zúñiga wrote *ζητήματων*)[86] with a word in the feminine gender.[87] But what led Zúñiga to conclude that the Translator wrote *omnes*? He does not, however, insist on the point, but says, 'We are able to suspect without doubt.' A strange expression indeed! Is it ever possible to suspect without feeling doubt? And if Zúñiga has no doubts about this, why does he fall back on a second explanation which is too silly to mention?[88]

* * * * *

85 This is the reading of the Greek text in Erasmus' New Testament, but Zúñiga clearly had a better reading which preserved these words in the same order as in the Vulgate.

86 Erasmus is correcting Zúñiga's accentuation of the Greek word.

87 This is another point about false agreement. The Greek text means 'because I know you to be expert in all the customs etc.' In Greek the word for 'customs' is neuter and the adjective 'all' naturally agrees with it. The Latin translation for 'customs' (*consuetudines*), however, is feminine. Erasmus suspects that the Vulgate carelessly maintained the Greek neuter adjective, although the Latin word it qualifies is feminine. Zúñiga proposed emending *omnia* to the feminine *omnes* to correct the grammar.

88 His second explanation is to regard the feminine nouns as being in apposition to *omnia quae* etc 'all things which are among the Jews, namely the customs …' (*Assertio* D 3v).

37. Romans 2<:15>. *inter se invicem cogitationum accusantium aut, etc* ['*of* their thoughts accusing one another or etc']. He puts the blame for this solecism on the copyists, although he produces no codex with a better reading. His statement that Ambrose followed the old translation is obviously wrong.[89] Jerome somewhere reads *cogitationibus*.[90] But not even Jerome follows this edition, although he departs from it less often than Ambrose.

38. Romans 10<:16>. *quis credidit auditui nostro* ['who has believed our hearing'] for *quis credidit uerbis nostris* ['who has believed our words?']. His defence against the charge that this is a solecism is as follows: 'If,' he says, 'this is a mistake in Latin, then it must also be a mistake in Greek, since the reading there is *ἀκοῇ*.' I agree that the Greek text also reproduces the Hebrew idiom. Does this very fact not make it a solecism by the standard of those who speak good Greek? And how relevant is it that Ambrose translated the phrase as 'What we have heard from you and say'?[91] But, he says, Jerome translated it the same way in his Isaiah,[92] as if Jerome does not often depart from the strict usage of the Roman tongue by adhering to Hebrew idiom; then he adds Jerome's suggestion that these words signify the small number of believers.[93] True, but what has this to do with the issue?[94]

39. Romans 12<:9>. He defends *odientes malum*[95] ['abhorring evil'] for *odio habentes* ['having an aversion to evil'] by pointing out that the Fathers said *odio, odis, odivi.* He cites no examples, however, despite the fact that the grammarians take a different view of the matter.[96] Nor should we immediately conclude that something is Latin because it is found in the outdated language of the past. Otherwise, anyone who said *scibo* for *sciam* ['I shall know']

* * * * *

89 Erasmus has in mind Ambrosiaster *Comm in Rom* 2:15–16, where the text has *cogitationibus* (ablative).

90 Jerome *Comm in Ezechielem* 5 (on 16:35–43) PL 25 151B. The genitives in the Vulgate are impossible to defend. They are a literal transfer of the Greek genitive absolute construction, for which the Latin equivalent is the ablative absolute; hence Jerome's *cogitationibus.*

91 Ambrosiaster *Comm in Rom* 10:16 PL 17 153A

92 Jerome *Comm. in Isaiam* 53:1 PL 24 524

93 Ibidem; see Zúñiga *Assertio* D 4r.

94 Literally 'What is this to Bacchus'; see *Adagia* III ii 92.

95 In 'good' authors of the Classical period *odi* is a defective verb, used only with the perfect stem. Present forms like *odientes* are ante- or post-classical.

96 For the grammarians' view see eg *Explanationes in Artem Donati; Liber II* in H. Keil *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig 1864, reprinted Hildesheim 1961) 549n and 555.

would be speaking properly, because Terence said it;[97] and *tiburchinabundus* ['voracious'] and *lurchinabundus* ['guzzling'] would be acceptable because they were said by Cato;[98] similarly, we should admit *hos lodices* ['these blankets'] because Pollio had the temerity to say it, and *gladiola* ['small swords'] because Messalla said so, and *parricidatus* ['parricide'] because we have the precedent of Caelius; nor are we entitled to say *hoc nasum* on the authority of Plautus;[99] and there are other examples too numerous to mention. I grant that Jerome, as a translator, used the phrase *odibunt scientiam* ['they will hate knowledge'],[100] but the fact that he used it does not automatically make it Latin. He also used *odiunt* in his translation of Isaiah,[101] and Ambrose read *odientes malum*.[102] Finally, he argues, Valla did not take up the passage. So what? The stick still stands in the corner![103] What a brilliant reasoner he is!

40. 2 Corinthians chapter 8<:15>. He defends *non minorauit* ['he did not lessen'][104] for *non minus habuit* ('he did not have less') with the argument that the Greek is *ἠλλατόνησεν*. But if the verb *ἐλλατονέω* is not acceptable in Greek or is used only in the active voice, then all he has proved is that both translators, in rendering a Hebrew idiom, made a linguistic blunder. He says, 'The Septuagint uses this word,[105] and so does Ambrose;[106] and Valla made no comment on the passage.' Well, what can we conclude from that? We are discussing solecisms. And it is Erasmus' 'quibble' that we are dealing with.

41. Philippians 4<:10>. I judged it poor Latin to write *refloruistis pro me sentire* ['you have flourished again to feel on my behalf'] for *reviguit* or *refloruit*

* * * * *

97 Terence *Eunuchus* 726 and frequently elsewhere in the early dramatists
98 These and the following three examples of rare words are cited from Quintilian *Institutio oratoria* 1.6.42.
99 *Hoc nasum* (neuter) for the regular masculine form *hic nasus* ('this nose') is frequent in Plautus, eg *Menaechmi* 168 and *Miles gloriosus* 1256.
100 Prov 1:22
101 *Odiunt* is a slip. The Isaiah passage (1:14) has *odivit*; cf Zúñiga *Assertio* D 4V.
102 Ambrosiaster *Comm in Rom* 12:10 PL 17 166C
103 The literal meaning of the Latin is 'So the stick stands in the corner.' This looks like an adage, but I have been unable to find it. It may mean 'you have no defence to beat off your opponents'; cf *Adagia* III iv 61: *absque baculo ne ingreditor* ('do not go without a stick').
104 The verb *minoro* is very rare in the classical period. Except in the Vulgate it is used in an active sense, 'to lessen.'
105 Septuagint: Ex 16:18
106 Ambrosiaster *Comm in 2 Cor* 8:15 PL 17 328A

uester in me affectus ['your love for me has grown strong again' or 'flourished again']. He appears to think that in this passage my only criticism concerned the word for 'flourishing,' while in fact this did not trouble me at all. But what Latin speaker has ever heard the phrase *refloruistis sentire*? Would anyone be likely to realize that *sentire* means *affectum esse* ['to be devoted'] or that *pro me* ['on my behalf'] means *de me* ['concerning me'] or *erga me* ['towards me']? But what were you to do? That was the reading of Ambrose,[107] and Valla did not criticize the passage! As the saying is, 'a white ruler against a white stone.'[108]

42. Hebrews 3<:3>. *quanto ampliorem honorem habet domus qui fabricavit illam* ['inasmuch as he who built the house has more honour of the house'].[109] Here is a case of Erasmus' wretched blindness, for he failed to notice that in this passage *domus* is in the genitive case, which is used instead of an ablative in accordance with the Greek construction! But this does not remove the solecism, it merely produces another. From now on, if we listen to Zúñiga, it will be permissible to say *faber est melior domus suae* ['the workman is better of his house'] for *faber est melior domo sua* ['the workman is better than his house']. And what made Zúñiga conclude that I failed to notice the case of *domus*, when I point it out in my annotation?[110]

43. Hebrews 6<:16>. *per majorem sui iurant*.[111] He maintains that this is Latin, since the Translator has copied a Greek idiom. So henceforth it will be correct to say *filius est minor patris* ['the son is lower of the father'][112] and *Zúñiga stultior est Coroebi* [for 'Zúñiga is a bigger fool of Coroebus'].[113]

* * * * *

107 Ambrosiaster *Comm in Phil* 4:10 PL 17 443A

108 *Adagia* I v 88: 'a white ruler against a white stone' is difficult to read. The proverb is used of those who lack discrimination.

109 In Greek a comparison ('than the house') can be expressed by the genitive case. The corresponding construction in Latin uses the ablative. Here the Vulgate, following the Greek idiom, uses the genitive (*domus* 'of the house').

110 Annotation on Heb 3:3 (*Habet domus*) ASD VI-10 276:585–94

111 'They swear by one greater *of* themselves.' Again the Vulgate has a Greek genitive of comparison *sui* instead of the Latin construction with the ablative.

112 Possibly a reference to the famous debate on Heb 2:7 ('Jesus was made a little lower than the angels' or 'lower than God'); see Erasmus' annotation on the passage *Minuisti eum paulominus ab angelis* ASD VI-10 240–70:103–528. Alternatively, the phrase may simply mean 'the son is younger than the father.'

113 Coroebus was a proverbial fool, who tried to count the waves of the sea; see *Adagia* II ix 64.

44. James 1<:13>. *deus enim intentator est malorum* ['for God is a provoker of evils']. Zúñiga wants this to be Latin for *deus nemini immittit tentationes ad mala* ['God sends temptations to evil to no one'], and he pities me for making the stupid error of thinking that *intentator* comes from *intento* ['I provoke'] (which he calls a simple verb, although it is as much a compound verb as the others), when *intentator* is a compound of *in* (as a privative) and *tentare* ['to tempt'] (like the Greek *ἀπείραστος*).[114] *Intentatus* was a possibility, but would any Latin speaker accept *indoctor* for 'someone who does not teach' or *inconsultor* for 'someone who does not consult'? Moreover, has anyone ever suggested that *ἀπείραστος* has an active meaning in Greek? And if it has, why does the writer immediately repeat the same point with *ipse enim neminem tentat* ['for he himself tempts no one']? Zúñiga's comments show us what James meant. But it was not James' meaning that I was discussing, but correct language.

45. In the Revelation 1<:4>, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος* ['from him who is, and was, and is to come']. Here Zúñiga is not content with quibbling criticism, but accuses me of blasphemy and impiety for holding that there are solecisms in the writings of the apostles, as if I am the only person who said this or that this is not rather a tribute to the glory of the Gospel and to Christ's glory than an insult to the apostles. They wrote for ordinary people and used ordinary language. They recognized no solecisms; it was among the educated, those who spoke correctly, that mistakes in language were recognized. If Zúñiga thinks it a sin to find a solecism in the letters of the apostles, that is to say, something which is not in accordance with the usage of those who speak correctly, he himself will be guilty of impiety if he fails to provide a stout defence of the passage from the charge of being ungrammatical.

Well, how does he go about it? 'Erasmus,' he says, 'ought rather to have admired these words and reflected that what he regarded as contrary to the rules of grammar was introduced to convey a sense of mystery.' What a splendid defence! He admits that the language does not conform to the

* * * * *

114 The argument is complex and hard to follow. Erasmus makes two points: first, that a word like *intentator* could not mean 'someone who does not tempt' – if it had any meaning, it would have to be derived from the verb *intento* 'to threaten' or 'to cause [evil]'; see Erasmus' annotation *ad loc*. Second, the Greek word which *intentator* is supposed to translate is passive and means 'one who is not tempted.' James says 'for God cannot *be tempted* with evil, neither tempteth he any man' AV. If the first phrase were translated as Zúñiga wishes, both parts of the sentence would mean the same.

rules of grammar and is contrary to Greek usage. Could there be any clearer proof that here we have a solecism? Does the presence of the mysterious remove the solecism? No, he would argue, it excuses it. But there is no need for excuses, unless there is something to excuse. I am not criticizing the apostles because they sometimes speak incorrectly, no more than if they had spoken Spanish.[115] By such an argument, Christ himself, in speaking Syriac to Syrians,[116] was guilty of error in the judgment of Hebrew speakers who spoke good Hebrew. If the unchangeable nature of God is signified by the use of indeclinable words, why is the word 'God' itself inflected through all the cases?[117] But suppose we allow two of these expressions, *ὁ ὤν* and *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, can we find for *ὁ ἦν* a meaning that would fit with *ὁ ὤν* and *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*? Finally, if the mystery here is so important, why did the Translator shy away from it and spoil the effect of the mystic solecism?

Now tell me, isn't this a bold and brilliant defence of the Translator and the Apostles! Now that the task has been successfully accomplished, all that remains for Zúñiga to do is to sing his song of triumph. He does this with all due seriousness, saying in his usual lying manner that Erasmus neglects the mysteries of Scripture and is interested only in elegance of style; that he does not spare the apostles and is even ready to correct their language; that he decked out his translation of the New Testament with the meretricious ornaments of style, often abandoning the Greek text and failing to observe proper Latin usage. And he promises more of the same sort – several additional volumes of elegant annotations – presumably, he is writing for the benefit of scholars, so that the whole world, on reading the writings of Zúñiga, will know that there existed a certain López, a man divinely inspired, who demonstrated with the most brilliant arguments that Erasmus knew nothing about language. And so henceforth everyone will venerate the name of

* * * * *

115 The argument is: The apostles wrote in a special dialect suited to their audience. They are no more to be faulted for this than if they had written in a different language. Syriac is a vernacular derivative of Hebrew, just as Spanish is a vernacular derivative of Latin. But defensible though the apostles' language is, it does not meet the standards of good Greek.

116 See Ep 2206:42–4: 'Christ did not speak pure Hebrew, but Syriac, a language corrupted by contact with other tongues.' Erasmus generally refers to Aramaic as 'Syriac.' See Henk Jan de Jonge, *Apologia ad annotationes Stunicae* ASD IX-2 140–1.

117 The common words for 'god,' *deus* in Latin and *θέος* in Greek, are both fully declined.

Zúñiga and revere him as a god.[118] When he is at full gallop in his invective, no one is more eloquent than Zúñiga. But when he gets down to the subject under discussion and must grapple with the issue at close quarters,[119] this little book shows what a lightweight he is. And yet the Dominicans have had this rubbish published at Rome[120] in spite of edicts issued by the pope and the cardinals.[121]

You will say, 'Why are you sending me such piffling stuff?' My answer is that I only wanted to make you laugh; for I know what a fine sense of humour you have. If that happens, I have hit my target.[122] And Zúñiga too has hit his target – for he is the talk of the town. That is the one thing he wanted. And this is the Zúñiga whom the great Béda proclaimed a consummate theologian, although all he claims for himself is that he is a second-rate theologian!

It was, I think, in March that you left the book of *Epistulae medicinales*[123] at Strasbourg with instructions that it be forwarded to me; it was delivered at Freiburg on the 13th of June. What remarkable dispatch! I do not know if you wrote from Frankfurt, but no letter has reached me. How often, my dear Hubertus, have I cursed that 'fifth essence'[124] of yours which robbed me of your sweet company after so short a time. I shall bear the loss more easily if you succeed in what you have set your heart on. This is the one thing missing to complete the cycle of your education; all the rest you have already completed successfully. So far you have been sowing the seed, now it is time to gather a rich harvest. Farewell.

Freiburg in Breisgau, 8 June 1529

* * * * *

118 The Latin text puns on *nomen* and *numen*: 'venerate the name (*nomen*) as a divinity' (*numen*).

119 *Adagia* v ii 15 (end) and cf i iv 29

120 Erasmus believed that the Dominicans at Rome encouraged Zúñiga's campaign against himself and assisted the Spanish scholar in publishing his polemical works; see Ep 1341A:878, where 'certain monks' are said to have published Zúñiga's *Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi* (A. Bladus: Rome 1522).

121 For Pope Leo's opposition see Ep 1213:35–40, and for that of Clement see Epp 1431:12–13; 1433:19–20; 1488:20; for the cardinals' ban see Ep 1302:59–61 and CWE 8, Appendix on the Vergara-Zúñiga correspondence, 346.

122 *Adagia* I X 30

123 Barlandus edited Giovanni Manardo's *Medicinales epistolae* (J Schott: Strasbourg 1529).

124 For 'fifth essence' Greek is used in the original. For this concept in philosophy see Ep 225 CWE 2 168 n12. In Ep 2081 Barlandus curses his study of the 'fifth essence' for the trouble and expense it caused him.

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

SHORT-TITLE FORMS
FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS CITED

GENERAL INDEX

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

Allen	*Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* ed P.S. Allen, H.M. Allen, and H.W. Garrod (Oxford 1906–58) 11 vols plus index
ASD	*Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami (*Amsterdam and Leiden 1969–)
Aviles	Miguel Aviles *Erasmo y la Inquisición* (Madrid 1980)
Bataillon	Marcel Bataillon *Erasme et l'Espagne* rev ed, text by Daniel Devoto, ed Charles Amiel (Geneva 1991) 3 vols
Beltrán de Heredia *Cartulario* VI	'La Conferencia de Valladolid en 1527 en torno a la doctrina de Erasmo' in *Cartulario de la Universidad de Salamanca* VI *Ultimos documentos* ed Vicente Beltrán de Heredia OP (Salamanca 1972)
CCCM	*Corpus christianorum. Continuatio mediaevalis* (Turnhout 1953–)
CCSA	*Corpus christianorum series Apocryphorum* (Turnhout 1983–)
CCSL	*Corpus christianorum series Latina* (Turnhout 1953)
CEBR	*Contemporaries of Erasmus. A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation* ed Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher (Toronto 1985–7; repr 2003) 3 vols
Cranfield	C.E.B. Cranfield *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh 1977)
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, Leipzig, and Prague 1866–)
CWE	*Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto 1974–)
De Jonge	Henk Jan de Jonge 'Erasmus and the *Comma Johanneum*' *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980) 381–90
DTC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* ed A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amman (Paris 1899–1950) 15 vols in 30 and index
Farge *Orthodoxy*	James K. Farge *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500–1543* (Leiden 1985)

Farge *Parti*	James K. Farge *Le parti conservateur au xvie siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme* (Paris 1992)
Gratian	*Decretum Gratiani in Corpus iuris canonici* ed A. Friedburg (Leipzig 1879–81) 2 vols
Holborn	*Des. Erasmi Roterodami Ausgewählte Werke* ed Hajo Holborn and Annemarie Holborn (Munich 1933)
Homza	Lu Ann Homza 'Erasmus as Hero, or Heretic? Spanish Humanism and the Valladolid Assembly of 1527' RQ 50 (1997) 78–118
LB	*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia* ed J. Leclerc (Leiden 1703–6; repr 1961–2) 10 vols
McConica	James K. McConica 'Erasmus and the Grammar of Consent' *Scrinium Erasmianum* ed Joseph Coppens (Leiden 1969) 2 77–99
Metzger	Bruce Metzger *A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament* (London 1971)
ODDC	*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* ed Frank Leslie Cross and Elizabeth A. Livingston 3rd ed (Oxford 1997)
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus … series Graeca* ed J.-P. Migne (Paris 1857–86); repr Turnhout) 162 vols; Indexes F. Cavallera (Paris 1912); T. Hopfner (Paris 1928–36) 2 vols
PL	*Patrologiae cursus completus … series Latina* ed J.-P. Migne 1st ed (Paris 1844–55, 1862–5; repr Turnhout) 217 vols plus 4 vols indexes
QGP	*Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus* (Leipzig 1904–32)
Rummel	Erika Rummel *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics* (Nieuwkoop 1989) 2 vols
Rummel	Erika Rummel 'Erasmus and the Valladolid articles: Intrigue, innuendo, and strategic defense' *Erasmus of Rotterdam. The Man and the Scholar* ed J. Sperna Weiland (Leiden 1988) 69–78
SC	*Sources chrétiennes* (Lyon 1942–)

Seidel Menchi	Silvana Seidel Menchi *Erasmo in Italia, 1520-1580* (Torino 1987)
Souter	*Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St Paul* ed Alexander Souter (Cambridge 1922–31) 3 vols
WA	*D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar 1883–)
Weber	*Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* ed R. Weber (Stuttgart 1969–83) 2 vols
Weinandy	Thomas Weinandy OFM *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction* (Aldershot 2007)

SHORT-TITLE FORMS FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

Titles following colons are longer versions of the same, or are alternative titles. Items entirely enclosed in square brackets are of doubtful authorship. For abbreviations, see Works Frequently Cited.

Acta: Academiae Lovaniensis contra Lutherum *Opuscula* / ASD IX-10 / CWE 71
Adagia: Adagiorum chiliades 1508, etc (Adagiorum collectanea for the primitive form, when required) LB II / ASD II-1–9 / CWE 30–6
Admonitio adversus mendacium: Admonitio adversus mendacium et obtrectationem LB X / CWE 78
Annotationes in Novum Testamentum LB VI / ASD VI-5–10 / CWE 51–60
Antibarbari LB X / ASD I-1 / CWE 23
Apologia: D. Erasmi Roterodami apologia LB VI / CWE 41
Apologia ad annotationes Stunicae: Apologia respondens ad ea quae Iacobus Lopis Stunica taxaverat in prima duntaxat Novi Testamenti aeditione LB IX / ASD IX-2
Apologia ad Caranzam: Apologia ad Sanctium Caranzam, or Apologia de tribus locis, or Responsio ad annotationem Stunicae … a Sanctio Caranza defensam LB IX / ASD IX-8
Apologia ad Fabrum: Apologia ad Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem LB IX / ASD IX-3 / CWE 83
Apologia ad prodromon Stunicae LB IX / ASD IX-8 / CWE 74
Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones LB IX / ASD IX-8 / CWE 74
Apologia adversus monachos: Apologia adversus monachos quosdam Hispanos (Loca quaedam emendata in second edition, 1529) LB IX / ASD IX-9
Apologia adversus Petrum Sutorem: Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris LB IX / ASD IX-9
Apologia adversus rhapsodias Alberti Pii: Apologia ad viginti et quattuor libros A. Pii LB IX / ASD IX-6 / CWE 84
Apologia adversus Stunicae Blasphemiae: Apologia adversus libellum Stunicae cui titulum fecit Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi LB IX / ASD IX-8
Apologia contra Latomi dialogum: Apologia contra Iacobi Latomi dialogum de tribus linguis LB IX / CWE 71
Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo': Apologia palam refellens quorundam seditiosos clamores apud populum ac magnates quo in evangelio Ioannis verterit 'In principio erat sermo' (1520a); Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo' (1520b) LB IX / ASD IX-9 / CWE 73
Apologia de laude matrimonii: Apologia pro declamatione de laude matrimonii LB IX / ASD IX-10 / CWE 71
Apologia de loco 'Omnes quidem': Apologia de loco taxato in publica professione per Nicolaum Ecmondanum theologum et Carmelitanum Lovanii 'Omnes quidem resurgemus' LB IX / ASD IX-9 / CWE 73
Apologia qua respondet invectivis Lei: Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei *Opuscula* / ASD IX-4 / CWE 72
Apophthegmata LB IV / ASD IV-4 / CWE 37–8
Appendix de scriptis Clichtovei LB IX / CWE 83
Appendix respondens ad Sutorem: Appendix respondens ad quaedam Antapologiae Petri Sutoris LB IX / ASD IX-9

Argumenta: Argumenta in omnes epistolas apostolicas nova (with Paraphrases)
Axiomata pro causa Lutheri: Axiomata pro causa Martini Lutheri *Opuscula* / ASD IX-10 / CWE 71

Brevissima scholia: In Elenchum Alberti Pii brevissima scholia per eundem Erasmum Roterodamum ASD IX-6 / CWE 84

Carmina LB I, IV, V, VIII / ASD I-7 / CWE 85–6
Catalogus lucubrationum LB I / CWE 9 (Ep 1341A)
Christiani hominis institutum, carmen LB V / ASD I-7 / CWE 85–6
Ciceronianus: Dialogus Ciceronianus LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 28
Colloquia LB I / ASD I-3 / CWE 39–40
Compendium vitae Allen I / CWE 4
Conflictus: Conflictus Thaliae et Barbariei LB I / ASD I-8
[Consilium: Consilium cuiusdam ex animo cupientis esse consultum] *Opuscula* / CWE 71
Contra morosos: Capita argumentorum contra morosos quosdam ac indoctos LB VI / CWE 41

De bello Turcico: Utilissima consultatio de bello Turcis inferendo, et obiter enarratus psalmus 28 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 64
De civilitate: De civilitate morum puerilium LB I / ASD I-8 / CWE 25
Declamatio de morte LB IV / ASD I-2 / CWE 25
Declamatiuncula LB IV / ASD IV-7
Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas: Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine facultatis theologiae Parisiensis LB IX / ASD IX-7 / CWE 82
De concordia: De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia, or De amabili ecclesiae concordia (on Psalm 83) LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 65
De conscribendis epistolis LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 25
De constructione: De constructione octo partium orationis, or Syntaxis LB I / ASD I-4
De contemptu mundi: Epistola de contemptu mundi LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 66
De copia: De duplici copia verborum ac rerum LB I / ASD I-6 / CWE 24
De delectu ciborum scholia ASD IX-1 / CWE 73
De esu carnium: Epistola apologetica ad Christophorum episcopum Basiliensem de interdicto esu carnium (published with scholia in a 1532 edition but not in the 1540 Opera) LB IX / ASD IX-1 / CWE 73
De immensa Dei misericordia: Concio de immensa Dei misericordia LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 70
De libero arbitrio: De libero arbitrio diatribe LB IX / CWE 76
De philosophia evangelica LB VI / CWE 41
De praeparatione: De praeparatione ad mortem LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
De pueris instituendis: De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 26
De puero Iesu: Concio de puero Iesu LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 29
De puritate tabernaculi: Enarratio psalmi 14 qui est de puritate tabernaculi sive ecclesiae christianae LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 65
De ratione studii LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 24
De recta pronuntiatione: De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione LB I / ASD I-4 / CWE 26

De taedio Iesu: Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristicia Iesu LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 70
Detectio praestigiarum: Detectio praestigiarum cuiusdam libelli Germanice scripti LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
De vidua christiana LB V / ASD V-6 / CWE 66
De virtute amplectenda: Oratio de virtute amplectenda LB V / CWE 29
[Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium: Chonradi Nastadiensis dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium] *Opuscula* / CWE 7
Dilutio: Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clichtoveus scripsit adversus declamationem suasoriam matrimonii *Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clichtoveus scripsit* ed Émile V. Telle (Paris 1968) / ASD IX-10 / CWE 83
Divinationes ad notata Bedae: Divinationes ad notata per Bedam de Paraphrasi Erasmi in Matthaeum, et primo de duabus praemissis epistolis LB IX / ASD IX-5

Ecclesiastes: Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi LB V / ASD V-4–5 / CWE 67–8
Elenchus in censuras Bedae: In N. Bedae censuras erroneas elenchus LB IX / ASD IX-5
Enchiridion: Enchiridion militis christiani LB V / ASD V-8 / CWE 66
Encomium matrimonii (in De conscribendis epistolis)
Encomium medicinae: Declamatio in laudem artis medicae LB I / ASD I-4 / CWE 29
Epistola ad Dorpium LB IX / CWE 3 (Ep 337) / CWE 71
Epistola ad fratres Inferioris Germaniae: Responsio ad fratres Germaniae Inferioris ad epistolam apologeticam incerto autore proditam LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
Epistola ad gracculos: Epistola ad quosdam impudentissimos gracculos LB X / CWE 16 (Ep 2275)
Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam LB IX / ASD IX-8 / CWE 15 (Ep 2172), 74
Epistola apologetica de Termino LB X / CWE 14 (Ep 2018)
Epistola consolatoria: Epistola consolatoria virginibus sacris, or Epistola consolatoria in adversis LB V / ASD IV-7 / CWE 69
Epistola contra pseudevangelicos: Epistola contra quosdam qui se falso iactant evangelicos LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
Euripidis Hecuba LB I / ASD I-1
Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide LB I / ASD I-1
Exomologesis: Exomologesis sive modus confitendi LB V / ASD V-8 / CWE 67
Explanatio symboli: Explanatio symboli apostolorum sive catechismus LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
Ex Plutarcho versa LB IV / ASD IV-2

Formula: Conficiendarum epistolarum formula (see De conscribendis epistolis)

Hyperaspistes LB X / CWE 76–7

In Nucem Ovidii commentarius LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29
In Prudentium: Commentarius in duos hymnos Prudentii LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 29
In psalmum 1: Enarratio primi psalmi, 'Beatus vir,' iuxta tropologiam potissimum LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63
In psalmum 2: Commentarius in psalmum 2, 'Quare fremuerunt gentes?' LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63

In psalmum 3: Paraphrasis in tertium psalmum, 'Domine quid multiplicate' LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63
In psalmum 4: In psalmum quartum concio LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 63
In psalmum 22: In psalmum 22 enarratio triplex LB V / ASD V-2 / CWE 64
In psalmum 33: Enarratio psalmi 33 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 64
In psalmum 38: Enarratio psalmi 38 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 65
In psalmum 85: Concionalis interpretatio, plena pietatis, in psalmum 85 LB V / ASD V-3 / CWE 64
Institutio christiani matrimonii LB V / ASD V-6 / CWE 69
Institutio principis christiani LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27

Julius exclusus: Dialogus Julius exclusus e coelis *Opuscula* ASD I-8 / CWE 27

Lingua LB IV / ASD IV-1a / CWE 29
Liturgia Virginis Matris: Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 69
Loca quaedam emendata: Loca quaedam in aliquot Erasmi lucubrationibus per ipsum emendata (see Apologia adversus monachos)
Luciani dialogi LB I / ASD I-1

Manifesta mendacia ASD IX-4 / CWE 71
Methodus (see Ratio)
Modus orandi Deum LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
Moria: Moriae encomium LB IV / ASD IV-3 / CWE 27

Notatiunculae: Notatiunculae quaedam extemporales ad naenias Bedaicas, or Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas LB IX / ASD IX-5
Novum Testamentum: Novum instrumentum 1516; Novum Testamentum 1519 and later (Greek and Latin editions and Latin only editions) LB VI / ASD VI-2, 3, 4

Obsecratio ad Virginem Mariam: Obsecratio sive oratio ad Virginem Mariam in rebus adversis, or Obsecratio ad Virginem Matrem Mariam in rebus adversis LB V / CWE 69
Oratio de pace: Oratio de pace et discordia LB VIII / ASD IV-7
Oratio funebris: Oratio funebris in funere Bertae de Heyen LB VIII / ASD IV-7 / CWE 29

Paean Virgini Matri: Paean Virgini Matri dicendus LB V / CWE 69
Panegyricus: Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27
Parabolae: Parabolae sive similia LB I / ASD I-5 / CWE 23
Paraclesis LB V, VI / ASD V-7 / CWE 41
Paraphrasis in Elegantias Vallae: Paraphrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae LB I / ASD I-4
Paraphrasis in Matthaeum, etc LB VII / ASD VII-1–6 / CWE 42–50
Peregrinatio apostolorum: Peregrinatio apostolorum Petri et Pauli LB VI, VII / CWE 41
Precatio ad Virginis filium Iesum LB V / CWE 69
Precatio dominica LB V / CWE 69

Precationes: Precationes aliquot novae LB V / CWE 69
Precatio pro pace ecclesiae: Precatio ad Dominum Iesum pro pace ecclesiae LB IV, V / CWE 69
Prologus supputationis: Prologus in supputationem calumniarum Natalis Bedae (1526), or Prologus supputationis errorum in censuris Bedae (1527) LB IX / ASD IX-5
Purgatio adversus epistolam Lutheri: Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Martini Lutheri LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78

Querela pacis LB IV / ASD IV-2 / CWE 27

Ratio: Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam (Methodus for the shorter version originally published in the Novum instrumentum of 1516) LB V, VI / CWE 41
Responsio ad annotationes Lei: Responsio ad annotationes Eduardi Lei LB IX / ASD IX-4 / CWE 72
Responsio ad Collationes: Responsio ad Collationes cuiusdam iuvenis gerontodidascali LB IX / CWE 73
Responsio ad disputationem de divortio: Responsio ad disputationem cuiusdam Phimostomi de divortio LB IX / ASD IX-4 / CWE 83
Responsio ad epistolam Alberti Pii: Responsio ad epistolam paraeneticam Alberti Pii, or Responsio ad exhortationem Pii LB IX / ASD IX-6 / CWE 84
Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas (see Notatiunculae)
Responsio ad Petri Cursii defensionem: Epistola de apologia Cursii LB X / ASD IX-10 / CWE 21 (Ep 3032)
Responsio adversus febricitantis cuiusdam libellum LB X

Spongia: Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni LB X / ASD IX-1 / CWE 78
Supputatio: Supputatio errorum in censuris Bedae LB IX
Supputationes: Supputationes errorum in censuris Natalis Bedae: contains Supputatio and reprints of Prologus supputationis; Divinationes ad notata Bedae; Elenchus in censuras Bedae; Appendix respondens ad Sutorem; Appendix de scriptis Clithovei LB IX / ASD IX-5

Tyrannicida: Tyrannicida, declamatio Lucianicae respondens LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29

Virginis et martyris comparatio LB V / ASD V-7 / CWE 69
Vita Hieronymi: Vita divi Hieronymi Stridonensis *Opuscula* / ASD VIII-1 / CWE 61

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Scriptural References

This index lists the citations and allusions made by Erasmus, but not those added for explanation or illustration.

Genesis
1:1 140 n648
17:7 169 n48
18:12–15 169 n48

Exodus
3:14 165 n20

Joshua
3:10 40
6:6–25 144

Judges
8:10 38 n156
11:2 339 n28
19:15 23 n96

1 Samuel
17:51 180 n111

2 Samuel
16:8 274 n172

1 Chronicles
17:4 274 n172

Psalms
1:1 84 n379
1:2 309 n44
2:1 207 n273
16:1–2 207 n279
18:38 350 n78
22:2 207 n280, 208 n283
22:6 219 n345
31:6 207 n281
33:9 147 n678
45:6 191 n186
45:7 60 n251
50:18 155 n717
68:19 21 n90
68:27 43 n173
69:17 195 n211
69:20 72 n317
78:63 32 n135
82:6 172 n64
110:10 214 n318
118:11 148 n681

Proverbs
1:22 345 n100

Isaiah
1:10–14 252 n62
7:14 162 n5, 170 n53
28:11–23 106 n484
42:1 195 n203 and n210
49:6 195 n208, 210 n297
56:10–12 250 n46
58:3–6 252 n62

Jeremiah
23:1–4 250 n47
23:9–40 250 n47

Hosea
1:3–5 170 n50

1:6 170 n51
1:9 92 n417, 170 n52
1:10 92 n417, 174 n82
2:24 92 n417

Amos
5:27 75 n335

Micah
5:2 23 n97

Zechariah
13:7–8 42 n169

Wisdom of Solomon
1:7 341 n37
17:18 158 n728

Matthew
1:3 14–17
1:6 17–19
1:11 19–21
1:23 21–2, 57 n234, 162 n4, 168 n41
2:1 22–3
2:16 23–4
3:2 24
3:7 25
3:8 25–6
4:1 26–7
4:24 27
5:3–4 52 n206
5:13 27
5:27 28
5:41 337
6:11 28
6:13 29
6:16 337–8
7:5 339
8:23 29–30
8:29 30–1, 339
9:16 50 n199
9:18–26 276 n180
10:2–4 305 n7, 317 n89
10:35 32
11:1 340
11:5 340
11:17 32–3
11:25 33–4
11:30 35
12:17–18 35–6
12:18 195 n204
12:31 251 n59
13:24–30 281 n204
13:35 76 n337
14:10 36–7
14:34 37
14:61–2 174 n80, 205 n252
15:1 341
16:16 173 n70, 174 n79
16:18 255 n75, 262 n110, 305 n9
16:18–19 306 n13
16:20 57 n231, 214 n317
16:32 121 n559
18:23–35 205 n259
18:24 37–8
18:28 38
18:32 229 n399
20:27–8 196 n212
20:25 341
20:28 71 n312, 198 n224, 341–2
21:33–40 205 n254
21:37 39
21:42 39–41
22:2–14 205 n260–1
22:10 342
22:16 41
22:30 342–3
23:5 244 n13
23:13 250 n48
23:15 261 n107
23:16–17 250 n49
24:6 343
24:45–7 205 n255
24:45–51 205 n262
24:48–51 205 n258
25:14–30 205 n256
26:31 41–4
26:63 72 n321
26:65 173 n68
27:37 66 n283
27:41–3 173n 69

27:48 44
27:65–6 85 n381
27:66 230 n406
28:18 322 n121
28:19 154 n708

Mark
1:2 45
3:16–19 317 n90
3:17 45–6
3:29 344 n55
5:41 46–7
8:29 174 n79
8:29–30 57 n231, 214 n317
8:33 47
10:44–5 196 n212
10:45 198 n224
10:63 47–8
12:1–2 205 n254
12:14 85 n381
12:15 85 n381
14:3 65 n273
14:62 72 n321
15:26 66 n285

Luke
1:63 48–9
1:68 88 n393
1:72 344–5
2:2 49–50
2:7 50
3:1 50–1
3:27 51
4:23 345
6:14–16 317 n90
6:35 226 n383
7:22 51–2
8:40–56 276 n180
9:20–1 57 n231
9:26 190 n171
10:6 298 n43
10:42 52
12:42–3 205 n255
12:43 52–3
12:45–6 205 n258
13:34 53–4
14:15–24 205 n260
16:1–8 205 n257
16:20 54
19:4 54–5
19:11–27 205 n256
19:22 229 n399
19:23 345
20:9–19 205 n254
21:27 174 n77
21:38 346
22:70 72 n321
23:29 346
23:38 56, 66 n285

John
1 168
1:1 x, 56–60, 162–7, 175–6, 285 n218
1:12 226 n383
1:14 176 n90, 346–7
1:20 344 n53
1:46 61
3:13 164 n12
4:9 347
4:17 344 n52
5:2 61–2
5:17 188 n160
5:18 173 n67
5:19 192 n193
5:41 173 n71
6:21 347
7:14 347–8
7:16 190 n177
7:38 62
7:53–8:11 267 n137
8:3 63
8:39 173 n72
8:41 173 n75
8:57 64
8:58 173 n73
10:30 174 n76
10:30–6 172 n65
10:31–8 72 n321
10:33 163 n8
12:3 64–5
12:31 192 n192
14:12 323 n123, 348
14:24 65

14:30 192 n192
15:2 348
15:6 348–9
15:15 69 n303, 197 n220, 205 n264, 206 n269, 214 n316
16:11 192 n192
17:1 205 n253
18:1 65–6
19:13 66
19:19 66
20:17 207 n277
20:21 253 n66
20:28 58 n238, 163 n9, 176–7
21:15–16 262 n111
21:18 214 n319

Acts
1:4 67
1:12 67
1:13 317 n90
1:14 68
1:19 68–9
2:12 349
2:22 57 n232
2:46 74–5
3:19 349
4:27 285 n218, 69–74, 194–232
5:4 349
5:15 253 n70, 276 n180
7:43 75–6
8:7 350
8:17 276 n179
8:32 76
8:40 76–7
9:40 46 n185
9:43 254
10:16 350
10:38 77
12:8 77–8
12:13 78
12:22 78–9
13:13 79
14:1 79–80
15:13–14 80
15:40 80
16:11 80–1
16:13 350
16:17 232 n413
17:15 350
17:28 192 n187
17:30 82
17:31 57 n232
18:3 82–3
19:9 83
19:12 276 n180
19:24 83
19:35 83–4
20:24 351
20:28 58 n239, 163 n11, 177–9
20:32 351
20:35 171 n57
21:14 351
22:3 100 n453
23:3 256–7
24:5 84–5
26:2 351–2
26:24–5 313 n67
27:40 85–6
27:41 86 n386
27:44 86

Romans
1:1 221 n361
1:3 86–7
1:9 221 n359
1:25 87–8
2:17 88
3:5 88–9
5:13 8 n30, 89–90
5:15 57 n232
5:19 90–1
6:19 101 n456
6:22 91
7:3 91–2
8:5 206 n270
8:15 74 n326, 92, 200 n230, 206 n265, 226 n380
8:19 226 n383
8:23 226 n383
8:30 92
9:5 59 n240, 180 n110, 257 n88
9:6 123 n571

9:25 92–3
9:26 226 n383
11:4 93–4
11:11 94–5
11:22 95–6
12:6 96
15:24 6 n19, 96–9
16:18 246 n21, 250 n51

1 Corinthians
1:11 100
1:21 34 n145
1:25 34 n144
1:27 34 n143
2:1 222 n367
2:2 222 n364
2:4 327 n17
4:3 100–2
6:20 102
7:1 102–3
7:12 254 n421
7:18 103–4
8:6 164 n15
9:4–12 318 n101
9:12 104–5
10:4 105, 199 n227
12:28 105–6
14:14–15 330 n180
14:19 270 n147
14:21 106–7
14:32 211 n305
15:28 211 n303
15:33 192 n188
16:8 107

2 Corinthians
1:6 107–8
1:24 108
2:3 108–9
4:8 109–10
5:21 220 n350
6:16 110, 165 n28
8:15 354
10:7 110–11
11:1 111
11:2 111–12
11:6 100 n452
11:32 112–13
12:13 246 n22
12:14 101 n457

Galatians
1:16 112–13
2:9 317 n91
3:1 113
3:8 113
3:25 229 n400
4:4 195 n205
4:6–7 232 n414
4:20 114
5:20 221 n358
6:2 114–15
6:15 9 n37

Ephesians
1:4 116
1:9 293
1:21 116
2:3 227 n390
2:14–15 117–18
2:19 118–19
3:15 119, 211 n306
3:19 119–20
4:27 120–1
5:5 191 n183
5:22 233 n417
5:22–4 103 n469, 215 n320
5:25 233 n418
5:31 233 n419
5:32 121, 232–8, 285 n218, 290 n12
6:5 229 n398

Philippians
1:1 122–3
2:4–6 165 n23
2:5 199 n227
2:6 59, 165 n19, 166 n32, 181 n119, 187 n150, 209–10
2:6–7 195 n206
2:7 181–4, 196 n215, 205 n263, 208, 221 n362, 231 n411
2:7–8 71
2:8 202 n240, 229 n402

2:8–9 184–7
2:9–11 323 n122
2:10 123
2:27 108
3:5 123–4
4:3 124–5
4:10 354–5
5:9 125–6

Colossians
1:2 126
1:15 165 n22, 185 n141
1:16 185 n142
1:18 185 n143
1:19 186 n144
1:25–6 259
1:27 293
2:2–3 186 n145
2:3 59 n245
2:4 186 n146
2:8 186 n147
2:8–9 184–7
2:9 59, 165–6, 185 n148, 188 n159
2:18 101 n458
2:21 251 n60
2:22 126
3:9 126–7
3:18 215 n320
3:18–19 103 n469
3:20 215 n320
4:16 127

1 Thessalonians
2:7 127–8
3:11 187 n149 and n154, 188 n158
5:23 128

2 Thessalonians
2:5 128–9
2:14 184 n132
2:16 182 n125, 184 n133
3:10 129

1 Timothy
1:3 130–1
2:9–15 103 n469
3:2 259 n101
3:6 131
3:11 131–2
3:16 293 n23
4:3 132
4:6 133
4:8 251 n61
4:15 133–4
5:8 298 n45
5:11 159 n733

2 Timothy
1:12 134
1:16 134–5
2:15 135–6
2:24 230 n407
3:2 137
3:8 137
3:16 137–8
4:6 138

Titus
1:1 138, 221 n360
1:7 139
1:8 260–1
1:12 192 n189
2:11 125 n580
2:13 59, 166, 189–91
3:10 139

Philemon
9 139–40

Hebrews
1:4–7 204 n250
1:6 140
1:7 140, 166 n35, 231 n409
1:8 60 n249, 140–1, 166 n34, 191 n185
2:1 141
3:3–7 204 n251
3:17 141
5:1 142
6:8 142
7:2 142
8:2 143
9:5 143
10:29 344 n55

11:1 143–4
11:30 144
12:16 144
13:2 16 n66
13:23 144–5

James
1:11 145
1:13 145–6, 356
1:22 146
2:16 146–7
3:7 147
5:15 147

1 Peter
2:3 147
2:5 148
2:7 148–9
2:14 149
4:15 149

2 Peter
2:1 246 n23
2:2 149–50
3:13 150

1 John
1:1 150
3:16 150
5:7–8 151–5
5:20 60 n253, 155, 167 n38, 192 n190

3 John
9 155–6

Jude
12 156

Revelation
1:13 156–7
2:2 157
2:13 157
6:8 157
8:7 157 n727
9:4 157 n727
10:3 158
16:3 158 n730
16:4 158
17:9 158–9
18:7 159
22:20 159–60

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited

This index lists the Greek and Latin words or phrases in Erasmus' own edition or the Latin in the Vulgate on which Erasmus makes some comment, but not other Greek words for which he simply gives a Latin equivalent or Latin words that are merely a translation for Greek ones.

GREEK WORDS

ἀγαθός 52
αἰσχύνη 114
αἰτέω 48
αἰτία 66
ἀκολουθέω 105
ἀμώμος 116
ἀναπληρόω 115
ἀνέχω 111
ἄξιος 26
ἀπείραστος 145–6
ἀποκεφαλίζω 36
ἀποστέλλω 23, 53
ἀπόχρησις 126
ἀπροσδόκητον 30
ἀργυροκόπος 83
ἁρμόζω 111
ἀρτέμων 85
αὐθάδη 139
αὐτὸς 53, 77, 348, 351 n81

βασκαίνω 113
βλέπω 110

γενόμενος 86
γνήσιος 124, 125
γυνή 68, 103, 131

διάβολος 26, 120–1
δοξάζω 92

εἰ δέ 88
ἐλλογέω 8, 89
ἐμβαίνω 29–30
ἐμπεριπατέω 110
ἐν γαστρί ἕξει 21
ἐξομολογοῦμαι 33
ἐξουσία 104
ἐπιμένω 107
ἐπιστέλλω 23
ἐπιτιμέω 47
εὐλογέω 87–8, 164
ἐχθρός 117

ἡγεμονέω 50

ἰδέ 88, 95
Ἱσπανία 6, 96

κάμπτω 123
κάμνω 147
κεδρών 65
κρατέω 38
κύριος 168, 208
κῶλον 141

λίτρα 64
λόγος 163, 351 n81, 155
λοιμόν 84–5

μεσότοιχον 117
μετα- 20

μετάθεσις 20
μετανοέω 20, 24
μετανοία 25
μεταπέμπω 20
μεταστρέφω 20
μετάφορα 20
μετοικεσία 20
μνημονεύω 128
μόναχος 266 n130
μόρον 55
μυστήριον xi, 121, 232, 235 n427
μωρός 34, 54

νεωκόρος 83–4
νήπιος 33, 34, 128
νοῦς 158
νύμφη 32
νυμφόστολος 112

ὀρθοτομέω 135
ὅτι 155, 343–4, 348

παῖς 11, 68, 69, 195, 196, 197, 202, 204, 206, 210
παραγγέλλω 129
πατήρ 92
προσέχω 141, 163
προσονομασία 119

σεληνιαζόμενος 27
σιτομέτριος 52
σῖτος 52–3
σκηνοποιοὶ 82
Σπανία 6, 96
σπαργανώμα 50
συμπολίτης 118
σωτήρ 170 n105

ὑπεριδών 72
ὑπόδησον 77–8

χαρίσματα 96
χρηματίζω 91
χρηστός 35, 147

LATIN WORDS

Acheldemach 68
adultera 91
adulterari 28, 33
alma 22
aporiari 109

Battavus 8, 19
benedicere 87–8, 156

calumniator 121, 131, 190
Cedron 65

delibari 138
demigratio 20
diabolus 26, 121, 131
dignus 25–6

evangelium 113
excussum 19
expoliari 126

filius 39, 69, 86, 355

genimen 25

invenire 76, 157

laborare 109–10, 147
libra 64
lunaticus 27

maceria 117
Maria 52, 64
Meditari 133–4
moechari 28
mysterium xi, 232, 290–6

occiari 8, 19, 83 n366
os 15
ossum 15

paternitas 119
pauper 51–2, 340
poenitentia 24, 25, 349
pontifex 142
pseudapostoli 250 n50

quasi 346–7
quotidianus 28

reperire 76
resipiscere 24

sacramentum xi, 121, 232, 290–6
salvator 179 n105
scena 82
servus x–xi, 7, 69, 219 n344, 225 n377
sycomorus 54, 55
syderatus 27

tamquam 346–7
transmigratio 19–20
tyrannus 83

unitio 203, 227, 232 n415
uterus 21

Verbum 56

zabulus 26, 27

General Index

Abba 48, 74, 92, 200, 206, 226
Achaz 162
Achilles 11, 98
Adrian VI xiii, xvi, 246 n26, 254 n73, 281 nn201–2, 300 n56, 314 n75, 315
Aeneas 11, 23 n99, 78
Aesop 334, 340
Agamemnon 220 n351
Ajax 113
Alcalá ix, xii, 3 n4, 177, 182, 202 n234, 214, 237 n438, 239, 240
Aleandro, Girolamo 27, 91, 246 n26, 295
Alexander the Great 9 n36
Alfonso V of Aragon 61 n356
Ambrose *passim*
– *De Cain et Abel* 102
– *De fide ad Gratianum* 179 n107, 184 n130, 188, 191 n182
– *De officiis* 142 n652
– *De vocatione omnium gentium*. *See* Prosper Aquitanus
– *Epistulae* 60 n302, 72 n315, 196 n216, 209 n291, 219 nn344 and 346–7, 220 n353
– *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* 50 n201, 52 n208, 330 n183, 343 n49
Ambrose of Calepio 126 n585
Ambrosiaster *passim*
Amerbach, Basilius 8, 114
Amerbach, Bonifacius 114 n528
Amerbach, Bruno 8, 114
Amerbach, Johann 114 n528
Anacharsis 101
Anderlecht, Carthusian monastery 109, 126
Anianus 29
Anthony of Padua 267 n135
Antwerp 152
– library of the Franciscans 152
Apelles 336
Apollinarianism xi, 7, 70, 72, 196, 198, 200, 201, 203, 204, 211 n302, 214, 216, 217, 237, 238, 301
Apollinaris of Laodicea 7 n22, 201 n232, 217
Apuleius 349
– *Apologia* 349 n75
Aramaic language xii, 3 n4, 13 n55, 68 n296, 256 n84, 357 n116
Aratus 101, 192
– *Phaenomena* 192 n187
Aretas 112
Argus 8, 93
Arianism xi, 7, 56 n230, 57, 70, 72, 74, 151, 153, 154, 163, 167, 172, 174, 176, 182, 193, 198, 200, 201, 203, 204, 211 n302, 222, 224, 225, 230, 237, 238, 258, 301
Aristarchus 36
Aristochius 139
Aristotle 170, 172, 194, 210
– *De anima* 172 n66
– *Physica* 210 n300
Arius 164, 167, 196, 217
Asiatic style 11
'Athanasius.' *See* Theophylact
Athanasius 61, 88, 228
Athenaeus 21
– *Deipnosophistae* 21 n86
Attic style 5, 33, 125, 222, 277

Augustine *passim*
– *[Ps] Altercatio ecclesiae et synagogae* 168 n45
– *Collatio cum Maximino* 153 n706
– *Contra Faustum* 87, 156
– *Contra Maximinum Arianum* 230 n404
– *De consensu evangelistarum* 12 n50
– *De diversis quaestionibus* 213 n313
– *De doctrina christiana* 14 n60, 15 n64, 17 n73, 48 n194, 331 n18
– *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* 122 n563, 236 n435
– *De ordine* 336 n12
– *De Trinitate* 183 n126
– *Enarratio in Psalmos* 185 n137
– *Epistulae* 203 n245, 265 n126, 328 n157, 331 n190
– *Locutiones in Heptateuchum* 15 n62
– *[Ps] Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* 180 n115
– *Sermones* 52 n208, 203 n246, 255 n77, 263 n115
– *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 62 n266, 63 n268
Augustus 41
Azotus 76

Baal 93–4
Babylon 19, 20, 75, 246
Bacchus 116, 342 n39, 353 n94
Bactrians 9
Barbaro, Ermolao 336
Barbier, Pierre x, xiii, xvi, 300 nn56–7
Barlandus, Hubertus 334, 358
Barnabas 74–5, 317
Bartimaeus 47–8
Basel 7 n26, 29, 53, 61, 109, 252 n64, 334 n2; Council of 109 n495, 235 n429; Dominican monastry 61, 109, 111, 120 n555, 157 n725
Bathsheba 19
Bede (the Venerable) 54, 81 n361, 107, 136, 148, 152, 153, 163, 185, 213, 263
Beelphegor 94
Beelzebub 94
Benedictines 270
Bernard of Clairvaux 246, 251, 298
– *De consideratione* 251 n58
Bethesda 61
blasphemies 250–2, 269, 277, 278
Boanerges 45
Boethius 14 n57
Bombace, Paolo xvi n22, 153, 244 n12, 300 n57
Briart of Ath, Jan 295 n34
Bruges ix, 90, 106, 113, 153, 345 n59
Brussels ix, 126
bull 'Exsurge Domine' 27, 283, 295 n37, 312, 313, 320, 324

Caesarea 12
Caiaphas 173, 174
Cain 169, 170 n49
Cajetano, Tommaso de Vio 320, 321, 323
– *De comparatione auctoritatis papae et concilii* 323 n124
Camillus, Marcus Ulpius 280 n199
Campeggi, Lorenzo 310, 315 n79
Capito, Wolfgang 283 n212
Caranza, Sanctius. *See* Carranza de Miranda, Sancho
Carranza de Miranda, Sancho *passim*
– *Opusculum in quasdam Erasmi annotationes* ix, x, 293 n22, 315 n76
Carvajal, Barnardino de 315 n77
Cassiodorus 207
– *Expositio in Psalmos* 207 n275
Cato 53, 139, 354
– *De agricultura* 53
celibacy 131, 259–60, 265 n123, 271 n151
Celsus 103
ceremonies xv, xvi, 269, 307, 327–8
Chaldaic language 13–14, 45, 68, 74 n330, 75
Chares of Lindos 126 n586
Charles v xvii, 4 n6, 277 n188, 284
Chloe 100
Christ, a servant *passim*; son of God 7; subordinate to the Father 7, 72; divinity of 56–60, 162–96, 257
Chrysostom, John *passim*
– *Homiliae* 12 n50, 39 n161, 62 n262, 64 n270, 69 n301, 82 n364, 131 nn609 and 611, 136 n625, 138 n637, 189

n169, 197 n219, 202 n237, 217 n335, 231 n410
Cicero 17, 36, 38, 101, 112, 119, 139, 239, 336, 342, 350, 352
– *In Verrem* 126 n588
– *De finibus* 224 n375
– *De officiis* 139
– *De oratore* 17 n61
– *Epistolae ad familares* 341 n36, 342 n40
– *Hortensius* 139
– *Pro Cluentio* 38 n158
circumcision 103, 123
Cisneros, Francisco Ximenes de ix, 3, 4 n6, 314 n72
Clement VII xvii, 310 n56, 358 n121
Clement of Alexandria 66, 104, 124
Clytemnestra 220 n351
Codex Montfortianus 155 n715
Codex Paulinus 87
Codex Rhodiensis. *See* Rhodian manuscript
College of St Donatian 90, 106, 113, 153, 345 n59
Cologne 248 and n37, 269, 283 n211, 295
Comma Johanneum 151–2, 154 n715
Complutensian Polyglot xii, 3 n4, 4 n6, 11 n46, 15 n63
confession xv, xvi, 33, 264, 268, 271, 306, 324–5
Constantinople 109 n495, 157 n725
Corinth 222
Coroebus 292, 355
Coronel, Pablo 15
– *Vocabularium … totius Veteris Testamenti* 15 n63
Corpus iuris 129 n603, 144
correctors 28, 63
Creed, Apostles' 72 n324, 183, 331 nn184–5; Athanasian 171 n58, 228; Nicene 87, 309
Croesus 97
Croy, Guillaume ix, 3 n4, 4 n6
Cumeanus 25 n149
Cyprian 26, 74, 132, 200, 246, 250, 255, 258, 263, 317, 321, 336
– *Adversus Iudaeos* 258 n95
– *De habitu virginum* 250 n55
– *Epistulae* 255 n78, 263 n115, 275 n174, 306 n16, 317 n96, 321 n116
– *Sententiae Episcoporum 87 de haereticis baptizandis* 251 n56
Cyril 151, 153, 308, 329
– *De thesauro* 151
Cyrinus. *See* Quirinus

Damascus 75, 112
Damasus I 12, 255, 273 n168, 306, 318, 319, 320, 321, 335
David 17, 18, 86, 180, 204, 216, 274
Demosthenes 102
Didymus 246 n24
– *De Spiritu Sancto* 246 n24
Dionysius Areopagita [Ps] 159, 235
– *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 235 n427
– *Epistolae* 159 n736
Dionysus 116 n539, 249 n41
Dioscorides 55
– *De materia medica* 55 n222
Dominicans 320 n110, 358
Dorp, Maarten van 99 n447, 264
Duns Scotus, John 227
Durandus of Saint Pourçain 291, 294, 326, 327

Easter 107, 271 n150
Eberlin, Johann 296 n39
– *Die xv Bundtsgenossen* 296 n39
Ebionites 13, 174 n81, 230
Eck, Johann 42 n168, 322
Egmondanus, Nicolas Baechem 99 n447, 282 n210
Emmanuel 57, 162, 168–72
enthymeme 225
Epimenides 192
Erasmus *passim*
– *Adagia* passim
– *Annotations* passim
– *Antidotus* 273 n167
– *Apologia ad Caranzam* 7 n23, 301 n60
– *Apologia ad Fabrum Stapulensem* 218 n339
– *Apologia against Jacques Lefèvre* 60 n250, 218
– *Apologia contra Stunicam* 1–160, 164 n18, 168 n42, 172 n63, 175 n85,

176 n93, 180 n114, 181 n120, 191 n184, 194 n197, 209 n294, 216 n326, 225 n378, 226 n384, 228 n394, 230 n403, 231 n410, 235 n430, 236 n433
– *Apologia ad Stunicae conclusiones* 304–31
– *Christiani hominis institutum* xii n10, 234 n425
– *Ciceronianus* 95 n429
– *Diatribe de libero arbitrio* 313 n66
– *Elegantiarum paraphrasis* 2
– *Enchiridion* 6, 224 n370, 241 n7, 261, 270 n145, 271 n154, 273 n167
– *Encomium matrimonii* 294, 295 n34, 326 n144, 331 n188
– *Institutio principis Christiani* 273 n165, 277 nn187–8, 326 n138
– *Iulius exclusus e caelis* 253 n67
– *Methodus* 154 n710, 191 n96, 193, 262, 275
– *Paraclesis* 273 n163
– *Paraphrasis in Elegantias Vallae* 76 n339
– *Praise of Folly* xiv, 33, 95 n429, 251, 252, 264 n121, 269 n143, 276, 277, 296 n39, 298 n46
– *Querela pacis* 274 n171
– *Ratio verae theologiae* 154 n170, 262 nn109 and 112, 263 nn116–17, 271 n151, 273 nn167 and 169, 275 n174, 309 nn45–7
– *Responsio ad annotationes Lei* 197 n221, 235 n426, 236 n436
– *Vita Hieronymi* 269 n143
Erigena, John Scotus 159 n737
Eucharist 235 n427, 291
Eumaeus 113
Eusebius 12 n50, 14, 68, 79, 104, 124 n577
– *Historia Ecclesiastica* 12 n50, 14, 68, 79 n349, 104, 124 n577
Eustochium 153, 165 n26
Euthalian hypotheses 131 n608
excommunication 277, 305, 319

Fabri, Johannes 310
Felix v 109
Ferrara, Council of 109 n497, 235 n429
Festus 313
Florence, Council of 272, 109 n497, 235 n429
Florus Diaconus of Lyon 185 n137, 213 n313
– *Expositio in Epistolas beati Pauli* 185 n137
Fonseca, Alonso de 4 n6
Franciscans 152, 215, 227 n389, 266, 328 n159
Freiburg xvii, 334, 358

Gamaliel 100
Gellius, Aulus 28, 78 n346, 113, 336
– *Attic Nights* 113 n523
Genezareth 37
George of Trebizond 29 n124
Gerbel, Nicolaus 8 n28
Gerson, Jean 322
Geryon xiv, 5
Getic language 17
Glossa ordinaria. See *Ordinary Gloss*
Goclenius, Conrad 283 n213
Golgotha 66
Gorgias 6 n20
Gospel of the Nazarenes 12, 256
grace *passim*
Gratian 325
– *De penitentia* 325 n135
Gregory IX 326 n140
Gregory of Nazianzen 290, 291 n17
Gregory of Nyssa 213
Guarino of Verona 82

Hainault 218
Ham 71, 198, 215 n324
Hebrew language *passim*
Hector 11, 113
Helios 126
Hercules 19, 42, 203 n243, 222, 310, 316 n85
Herod I 41 nn165–6
Herod Antipas 23, 41, 78, 112, 194
Herodians 41
Hesiod 34, 336
– *Theogonia* 336 n15
Hesychius 84, 109, 139
– *Lexicon* 84 n373, 109 n502, 139 n644
heterosis 66

Hilary 59 n243, 73, 74 n328, 123, 165, 206, 218, 336
– *De trinitate Dei* 123 n568, 155, 165
– *Tractatus in Psalmos* 207 n273
Holland 9
Homer 11, 34, 46, 55, 98, 113, 125, 180 n112, 242 n3
– *Iliad* 11 n48, 34 n142, 55 n226, 125 n581
– *Odyssey* 84 n372, 113 nn521–2, 180 n112
Horace 10 n42, 11 n45, 50 n200, 82, 289 n6, 339 n27, 346
– *Ars poetica* 10 n42, 11 n45, 50 n200, 295 n35, 346 n60
– *Epistles* 82, 289 n6, 339 n27
– *Satires* 216 n329, 245 n15
Hugh of St Cher 64, 133
– *Postilla* 64 n271
Hus, Jan 295, 311 n58
Hussites 311
Hutten, Ulrich von 283 n212, 297 n41
Hylas 280
hypostasis 163, 164 n13, 175, 176, 201 n232

Iconium 79–80
immaculate conception 227 n389
Innocent 320–1
Interpres Hebraicorum nominum 45, 54, 75
Isaac 169, 206
Isaiah 75, 162, 171, 196, 250, 251
Isocrates 102

Jasub 171 n60
Jeremiah 76, 250
Jericho 144
Jeroboam 284
Jerome *passim*
– *Catalogue of Illustrious Writers* 12
– *Contra Iovinianum* 265 n123
– *Contra Pelagianos* 13, 63
– *Contra Vigilantium* 265 n122
– *Dialogus adversus Pelagium* 256 n83
– *Epistolae* 36
Jesus. *See* Christ
Joseph (earthly father of Jesus) 73, 200, 218
Joseph (patriarch) 174
Josephus, Flavius 50, 51, 79
– *Antiquitates Iudaicae* 50 n197, 79 n349
– *Bellum Iudaicum* 51 n202
Jovinianus 68, 265
Judaism 174, 251, 261–2
Judea 22–3
Julius II 253, 319

Karlstadt, Andreas 276 n177

Lactantius 26 n110
– *De mortibus persecutorum* 26 n110
Lateran Council 324 n127
Latomus, Jacobus 99 n447
Lazarus 54
Lee, Edward 21, 22, 39, 63, 67, 70, 99 n447, 122, 144, 151, 154, 197, 235, 236, 294, 318 n98, 320 n108, 327, 329
Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques 5 n15, 10, 14, 202, 247 n31, 249
Leo X xiv, 16, 70 n310, 242 n4, 244, 246 n26, 255 n81, 276, 279 n193, 283, 304 n4, 314, 320, 324
Leoniceno, Niccolò 336 n10
– *De Plinii et aliorum erroribus in medicina* 336 n10
Liber vocum Hebraicorum 137
Lindans 126
Liturgy of the Hours 87 n392
Livy 36, 137 n632
locative case 79 n353, 138
Lombard, Peter 121, 209, 220, 235, 238, 290–1, 294, 295, 312, 326
– *Sententiae* 121 n561, 209 n289, 226 n385, 227 n386, 236 n431, 238 n439, 257 n87, 312 n62
Lord's Prayer 28 n117, 29, 258
Louvain xiii, 99, 248, 264 n121, 267, 282, 283 n211, 295, 335
Lucian 18
– *Eunuchus* 81 n358
Lucretius 25
Luther, Martin *passim*
– *De votis monasticis* 264 n118
– *Resolutiones* 283 n211, 298 n44
Lutheranism *passim*
Lynceus 22 n91, 93
Lyra. *See* Nicholas of Lyra

Maccabees 97
Magister noster 289 n10
Malachias 206
Manardo, Giovanni 358 n123
– *Epistolae medicinales* 358
Manichaeans 170
Marcion 169
Marck, Erard de la 27 n112
marginal notes 110 n504
Marguerite of Navarre 5 n15
marriage 30, 103, 111–12, 232–4, 292, 307; for priests 68; a sacrament 233–4, 254, 272, 290–6, 307, 325–7
Mary 64, 73, 165 n26, 200, 227
Matthew 44, 60, 66, 337; wrote in Hebrew 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 47; author of the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* 256
Maximinus 154
Medici, Giulio de 27 n112
Menander 192
Midas 97
Momus 104, 116, 336
More, Thomas 283 n213
Mosaic law 59, 90, 115, 185, 196, 324
Moses 59, 90, 165 n20, 192, 204, 224
mystical books 168, 207, 210
mystical meaning 18, 30, 37

Naples 6, 80–1
Nazarenes 12, 13
Nazareth 61
Nebrija, Elio Antonio de 11, 47, 62, 66, 67, 71, 98, 198
– *Quinquagenae* 11 n46, 47, 66, 67, 85 n383
Nero 9, 24
Nesen, Konrad 99 n447
– *Dialogus Bilinguium et Trilingium* 99 n447
Nestorians 164 n13
Nestorius 164
Nicholas of Lyra 62, 67, 148, 149, 156
Noah 71, 199, 215 n324
Noetianism 178, 237
Noetians 178
Noetius 178 n104

O-antiphons 266 n134
Occam, William of 322
Odysseus. *See* Ulysses
Oecolampadius, Johannes 7, 8, 19, 22, 46, 51, 54, 77, 94 nn422–3
Oecumenius 110 n506, 111 n509, 118 n545, 127 nn589–90 and 592
Onesiphorus 134–5
Oppian 101, 249 n39
– *Halieutica* 249 n39
Ordinary Gloss 18, 67, 72, 86 n385, 107 n489, 113, 125, 126, 134, 154, 183, 185, 199, 213
Orestes 220
Origen 12, 13, 39, 88, 89, 91 n411, 94, 103, 132, 159, 164, 177, 179 n109, 255, 263, 281, 311, 317
– *Commentarii* 82 n364, 88 n394, 89 n401, 94 n426, 124 n575, 164 n16, 255 n76, 258 n93, 263 n115, 317 n95
– *De principiis* 103 n472
– *Homiliae* 39, 159 n737
Origenists 179
Orléans 279

Pamphilius 12
Paris, Sorbonne University 170, 211, 222, 223, 237, 260
Paschasius Radbertus 165 n26
– *De assumptione Mariae virginis* 165 n26
Pasquillus 248, 315
Patripassianism 178, 237, 301
Paul *passim*
Paul of Samosata 167
Pelagianism 281
Pelagius 320
penance 57, 291, 306 n19
Penelope 113
Pentecost 107, 271 n150
Perotti, Niccolò 85–6
– *Cornucopiae* 85 n384
Persius 2
Peter *passim*
Pfefferkorn, Johann 268, 269 n142
Pharisees 173, 250, 253, 261, 264
Philo 299
philosophy of Christ 243
Photius 127 n589
pilgrimages xv, 270, 330 n176
Pirckheimer, Willibald 300 n55

Platina, Bertolomeo 276
– *Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum* 276 n182
Plato 6 n20, 102, 174, 299
– *Phaedrus* 6 n20
Plautus xvii, 10, 137, 354
– *Aulularia* 10 n39
– *Menaechmi* 338 n22, 354 n22
– *Miles gloriosus* 137 n631, 354 n22
– *Truculentus* 221 n355
Pliny Jr 24
– *Epistulae* 24
Pliny Sr 96, 116 n535, 336
– *Naturalis historia* 96 n439, 116 n535, 336 n13
Plutarch 44, 116, 129
– *De gloria Atheniensium* 116 n535
– *Moralia* 129 n602, 221 n356
– *Vitae parallelae* 44, 82 n362, 98 n444
Poggio Bracciolini 2
Poliziano, Angelo 24
Polyphemus 180
Poncher, Etienne 27 n112
pope, authority of 261, 262 n113, 276, 284; primacy of Roman pontiff 255, 263, 269, 275, 305–6, 317–24
Porsena, Paolo Cristoforo 136 n626, 164 n18
Priscian 25, 79, 146, 147
– *Institutiones grammaticae* 79 n353
proofreaders 8, 23, 76, 106, 158
Prosper Aquitanus
– *De vocatione omnium gentium* 207 n274
Proteus 209

Quintilian 66 n284, 348 n68, 354 n98
– *Institutio oratoria* 66 n284, 348 n68, 354 n98
Quirinus 49, 50

Remigius of Auxerre 54
res signifians 236 n437
res significata 236 n437
resurrection of the body 179
Reuchlin, Johann 18, 61, 66, 157
– *De rudimentis Hebraicis* 66 n280
– *De verbo mirifico* 18 n78
Rhenanus, Beatus 252 n64, 283 n213
Rhodian manuscript 75, 106, 108–9, 146, 150, 151, 154, 155, 157, 193 and n195
Rhodians 126
Rome *passim*
Rufinus 12 n50, 50, 51, 79 n349, 82 n364, 265

Sabellianism 178, 201
Sabellius 179 n104, 201 n232, 237, 238
sacrament *passim*
Salathiel 51
Santiago de Compostela 270, 298 n46, 330 n176
Scholasticism xv, 95 n429, 117 n541, 121 n561, 154 n710, 203, 211, 224 n370, 272, 285, 297 n41, 304, 312 n62, 322
Scythia 101
Seneca 36, 37, 38, 83
– *Apocolocyntosis* 36, 38 n157
– *De brevitate vitae* 83 n367
– *Letters to Paul* 129
Septuagint xii, 43, 52, 65, 110, 204, 210, 354
Simeon 80
Simon 80, 254
Sogdians 9
Solomon 18, 62
speculation 154 nn710–11
Stojkovic, Johann 109
Stunica, Jacobus Lopis. *See* Zúñiga, Diego López
Suetonius 23 n99, 78, 343
– *Vitae* 23 n99, 78 n344, 343 n48
Suida 50, 84, 97, 159
– *Lexicon* 50 n198, 84 n373
Syriac language 13, 14, 37, 39, 45, 68 n296, 92, 94, 357

Tabitha 46–7
Terence 24 n101, 342, 354
– *Adelphoe* 24 n101
– *Andria* 65 n275
– *Eunuchus* 33 n139, 261 n104, 294 n25, 354 n97
– *Heautontimorumenos* 342 n43
Tertullian 142 n652, 168, 169, 175, 178, 194, 206, 250, 342

– *Adversus Marcionem* 168 n46, 175 n89
– *Adversus Praxean* 178 n98, 207 n276
– *De cultu feminarum* 250 n54
Tharsos 101
Theodoretus 110
Theodorici, Vincent 99 n447
Theophrastus 55
– *Historia plantarum* 55 n222
Theophylact *passim*
Thersites 11, 113
Thomas (apostle) 163
Thomas Aquinas 14 n57, 58, 95, 163, 185, 238, 263, 298, 312, 336
– *Catenae aurea* 163 n10, 263 n115
– *Summa theologiae* 257 n87, 312 n62, 328 n162
Thraso 33, 261, 278, 294
Translator *passim*
Trinity 151 n698, 152, 167 n37, 175 n88, 178 n104, 180, 191, 201 n232, 203 n246, 228 n393
Turks 274, 298
Turin 290 n10
Turnus 11
typesetters 8, 19, 23, 61, 80, 91, 106, 108, 110 n504, 142
typology 210 n298

Ulysses 113, 180 n112
unction, extreme xvi, 291, 306, 325
Uriah 19 n79

Valdensians 295
Vales, Peter 295 n32
Valla, Lorenzo *passim*
– *Annotationes ad Novum Testamentum* 217 n337
– *Elegantiae* 38 n155, 119 n548
– *In Latinam Novi Testamenti interpretationem … adnotationes* 16 n68, 335 n6
Varro 25
– *Andabatae* 25
Vergara, Juan ix, xiv, 4 n6, 167 n40
Vigilantius 265
Virgil 11, 26 n107, 65 n276, 78, 101, 224 n371, 239, 342
– *Aeneid* 11 n47, 65 n276, 78 n348, 84 n372, 224 n371, 342 n39
– *Eclogues* 26 n107
– *Georgics* 82 n365, 101 n459
Vives, Juan Luis ix, 27 n112, 167 n40
Volz, Paul 261
Vulgarius. *See* Theophylact
Vulgate *passim*

Word x, 56–60, 151 n693, 152, 154, 162–4, 175
Wycliffe, John 262 n113, 295, 311 n58
Wycliffites 262, 311

Zasius, Ulrich 283 n213
Zúñiga, Diego López *passim*
– *Annotationes contra Erasmum* xii, 162 n1, 202 nn234 and 239, 233 n420, 244 n10, 247 n27
– *Annotationes contra Fabrum Stapulensem* 5, 247 n31, 249 n44, 288 n3, 300 n54, 314 n71
– *Assertio* xvii, 334 n1, 336 n14, 338 n21, 339 n27, 347 n72, 353 n93, 354 n101
– *Blasphemiae et impietates* passim
– *Epistola ad Pontificem noviter electur* 277 n183
– *Precursor* xv, 288 n2, 305 n5

This page intentionally left blank

The design of
THE COLLECTED WORKS
OF ERASMUS
was created
by
ALLAN FLEMING
1929–1977
for
the University
of Toronto
Press